THE *PHOENICIAN HISTORY* OF PHILO OF BYBLOS

A COMMENTARY

ÉTUDES PRÉLIMINAIRES AUX RELIGIONS ORIENTALES DANS L'EMPIRE ROMAIN

PUBLIÉES PAR

M. J. VERMASEREN

TOME QUATRE-VINGT-NEUVIÈME

ALBERT I. BAUMGARTEN

THE *PHOENICIAN HISTORY* OF PHILO OF BYBLOS

A COMMENTARY

LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1981

ALBERT I. BAUMGARTEN

THE *PHOENICIAN HISTORY* OF PHILO OF BYBLOS

A COMMENTARY

LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1981

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. A further subsidy was awarded by the Arts Research Board of McMaster University.

ISBN 90 04 06369 2

Copyright 1981 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN BELGIUM

To the memory of my Father

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments IX
Index of Abbreviations and Bibliography XI

I. The Main Problems 1
II. The Greek Text 8
III. Biographical Data 31
IV. Porphyry's Account of Sanchuniathon 41
V. Philo's Account of Sanchuniathon 63
VI. The Cosmogony 94
VII. The Discoverers 140
VIII. The Life of Kronos 180
IX. Kronos' Victory & Philo's Conclusion 214
X. Child Sacrifice & Snakes 244
XI. Conclusions 261

Index of Names 269
Index of Passages 277

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My acquaintance with Philo of Byblos goes back many years. What was first proposed as an M.A. topic became a doctoral thesis, and now this book. Over these years, I have been helped by family, teachers, friends and institutions whose assistance it is a pleasure to acknowledge.

First comes my family who have encouraged me to pursue an academic career. A life of teaching and research makes special demands. My wife and children have always been helpful and supportive, for which I am grateful.

The members of the doctoral supervisory committee at Columbia University contributed significantly to my education and to the original thesis. I owe a special debt of gratitude to my former supervisor, Professor Morton Smith. Many of his oral suggestions have been incorporated in the text and notes of my commentary. Numerous suggestions by the other committee members—E. J. Bickerman, M. Held, J. Teixidor and J. Schmidt—also appear. Responsibility for the contents is, of course, mine.

A book, I believe, belongs to a somewhat different academic genre than a thesis. In the process of turning my thesis into a book, I have had the advantage of extensive discussions with my colleague, E. P. Sanders of McMaster University. I have a double obligation to Professor Vermaseren, the editor of *EPRO*. He has supplied much good advice and encouragement in the process of accepting this book for the series.

The problem of how to integrate the Greek text of Philo's fragments with my translation and commentary was hard to resolve. The solution I have adopted (see the discussion below, p. 7) has been facilitated by the permission to reprint the fragments as edited by Jacoby, granted by E. J. Brill and Co., the holder of the copyright on Jacoby's work.

If education has become expensive, publication is prohibitive. This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. A further subsidy was awarded by the Arts Research Board of McMaster University.

INDEX OF ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANEP = J. Pritchard, *The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton, 1954).

ANET = J. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament, Third Edition, with Supplement* (Princeton, 1969).

Abel, "Inscriptions," = F. M. Abel, "Inscriptions de Transjordanie," *Revue Biblique*, Vol. 5 (1908), pp. 567-578.

Aharoni, "Lebanon," = Y. Aharoni, "Lebanon," *Encyclopedia Miqrait*, Vol. 4 (Jerusalem, 1962), cols. 425-430.

Aisleitner, *Wörterbuch* = J. Aisleitner, *Wörterbuch der Ugaritischen Sprache*, in *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, Vol. 106, Heft 3 (1963).

Albright, "Aleyan Baal & Mot," = W. F. Albright, "The North Canaanite Epic of Aleyan Baal and Mot," *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, Vol. 12 (1932), pp. 185-208.

Albright, "Anath and the Dragon," = W. F. Albright, "Anath and the Dragon," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Vol. 84 (1941), pp. 14-17.

Albright, *ARI* = W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (Garden City, 1969).

Albright, "Clemen," = W. F. Albright, "Review of Clemen, *Die Phönikische Religion nach Philon von Byblos*," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 60 (1941) pp. 208-212.

Albright, "Dwarf Craftsmen," = W. F. Albright, "Dwarf Craftsmen in the Keret Epic," *Eretz Israel*, Vol. 3 (1954), pp. 58-59.

Albright, *FSAC* = W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (Garden City, 1957).

Albright, "Hauron," = W. F. Albright, "The Canaanite God Hauron," *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, Vol. 53 (1936), pp. 1-12.

Albright, "Neglected Factors," = W. F. Albright, "Neglected Factors in the Greek Intellectual Revolution," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 116 (1972), pp. 225-242.

Albright, "Recent Progress," = W. F. Albright, "Recent Progress in North Canaanite Research," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Vol. 70 (1938) pp. 18-24.

Albright, "Role of the Canaanites," = W. F. Albright, "The Role of the Canaanites in the History of Civilization," in G. E. Wright (Ed.), *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Garden City, 1965), pp. 438-487.

Albright, *YGC* = W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (Garden City, 1969).

Alexander, "Targumim," = P. S. Alexander, "Targumim and Early Exegesis of the Sons of God," *Journal of Jewish Studies*, Vol. 23 (1972), pp. 60-71.

Alt, *Essays* = A. Alt, *Essays in Old Testament Religion and History* (Garden City, 1968).

Alt, *KS* = A. Alt, *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte Israels* (Munich, 1959).

Amadasi, "Sid," = M. G. G. Amadasi, "Noto sul Dio Sid," *Ricerche Puniche ad Antas = Studi Semitichi* Vol. 30 (1969), pp. 95-104.

Astour, *HS* = M. C. Astour, *Hellenosemitica* (Leiden, 1967²).

Avishur, "Studies," = Y. Avishur, "Studies of the Stylistic Features Common to Phoenician Inscriptions and the Bible," *Ugarit Forschungen*, Vol. 8 (1976), pp. 1-22.

Avishur, "Word Pairs," = Y. Avishur, "Word Pairs Common to Phoenician and Biblical Poetry," *Ugarit Forschungen*, Vol. 7 (1975), pp. 13-47.

Avi Yonah, "Mt. Carmel," = M. Avi Yonah, "Mt. Carmel and the God of Baalbek," *Israel Exploration Journal*, Vol. 2 (1954), pp. 118-124.

BDB = F. Brown, S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1962).

BH = R. Kittel et al., *Biblia Hebraica* (Stuttgart, 1966).

Barnes, *Tertullian* = T. Barnes, *Tertullian, A Historical and Literary Study* (Oxford, 1971).

Barnett, "Walcot," = R. D. Barnett, "Review of Walcot, *Hesiod*," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 88 (1968), pp. 150-152.

Barr, "Philo of Byblos," = J. Barr, "Philo of Byblos and his Phoenician History," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Vol. 57 (1974/5), pp. 17-68.

Barrelet, "Deesses Armées," = M. T. Barrelet, "Les Deesses Armées et ailées," *Syria*, Vol. 32 (1955), pp. 222-260.

Baudissin, *Adonis* = W. W. Baudissin, *Adonis und Eshmun* (Leipzig, 1911).

Baudissin, "Sanchuniathon," = W. W. Baudissin, "Sanchuniathon," *Protestantliche Real Encyclopädie*, Vol. 17, pp. 452-470.

Baudissin, *Studien* = W. W. Baudissin, *Studien zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte* (Berlin, 1911).

Baumgarten, "Myth and Midrash," = A. I. Baumgarten, "Myth and Midrash: Gen. 9:20-29," in J. Neusner (Ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty* (Leiden, 1975), Vol. 3, pp. 55-71.

Baur & Rostovtzeff, *Excavations at Dura, Fourth Season* = P. V. C. Baur and M. Rostovtzeff, *Excavations at Dura Europus, Preliminary Report, Fourth Season* (New Haven, 1932).

Beare, "Books and Publication," = F. W. Beare, "Books and Publication in the Ancient World," *University of Toronto Quarterly*, Vol. 14 (1945), pp. 150-167.

Beaujeu, *Religion Romaine* = J. Beaujeu, *La Religion Romaine à l'Apogée de l'Empire* (Paris, 1955).

Benz, *Personal Names* = F. Benz, *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions* (Rome, 1972).

Bickerman, "Christians," = E. J. Bickerman, "The Name of Christians," *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 42 (1949), pp. 109-124.

Bickerman, "Faux Littéraires," = E. J. Bickerman, "Faux Littéraires dans l'antiquité classique," *Rivista di Filologia*, Vol. 101 (1973), pp. 22-41.

Bickerman, "Origines Gentium," = E. J. Bickerman, "Origines Gentium," *Classical Philology*, Vol. 47 (1952), pp. 65-81.

Bidez-Cumont, *Mages Hellénisés* = J. Bidez and F. Cumont, *Les Mages Hellénisés* (Paris, 1938).

Birt, *Antike Buchwesen* = T. Birt, *Das Antike Buchwesen* (Berlin, 1892).

Bisi, *Stele Puniche* = A. M. Bisi, *Le Stele Puniche* (Rome, 1967).

Blass & Debrunner, *Grammar of the NT* = F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, Translated from the German by R. W. Funk (Chicago, 1961).

Bleeker, *Hathor & Thoth* = C. J. Bleeker, *Hathor and Thoth*, *Numen Suppl.* No. 26 (1973).

Blinkenberg, *Tempelchronik* = C. Blinkenberg, *Die Lindische Tempelchronik* (Bonn, 1915).

Bochart = S. Bochart, *Phaleg et Canaan* (Cadomus, 1646).

Bouché-Leclercq, *Astrologie Grecque* = A. Bouché-Leclercq, *L'Astrologie Grecque* (Brussels, 1963).

Bousset, *Hauptprobleme* = W. Bousset, *Die Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* in *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, Vol. 10 (1907).

Boyancé, "Les Archontes de Platon," = P. Boyancé, "Dieu Cosmique et dualisme: Les Archontes de Platon," in U. Bianchi, *Le Origine dello Gnosticismo* (Leiden, 1967), pp. 348-356.

Boylan, *Thoth* = P. Boylan, *Thoth the Hermes of Egypt* (Oxford, 1922).

Brandon, *Creation Legends* = S. G. F. Brandon, *Creation Legends of the Ancient Near East* (London, 1963).

Breccia, *Musée Greco-Romaine* = E. Breccia, *Le Musée Greco-Romaine 1925-1932* (Bergamo, 1932).

Breasted, *Ancient Records* = J. H. Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt* (New York, 1962).

Bright = J. Bright, *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia, 1959).

Bright, *Jeremiah* = J. Bright, *Jeremiah* (Garden City, 1965).

Brown, "Euhemeros," = T. R. Brown, "Euhemeros and the Historians," *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 39 (1946), pp. 259-274.

Buchsel, "Monogenes," = O. Buchsel, "Monogenes," *Theological Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. 4, pp. 737-741.

Budge, *Book of the Dead* = E. A. T. W. Budge, *The Book of the Dead* (London, 1960).

Bunsen = C. J. Bunsen, *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, Translated from German by C. H. Cottrell (London, 1848-67).

Burney, *Poetry* = C. F. Burney, *The Poetry of Our Lord* (Oxford, 1925).

CAD = I. J. Gelb et. al., *The Assyrian Dictionary* (Chicago, 1961-).

CIL = *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (Berlin, 1862-).

CIS = *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* (Paris, 1881-1962).

Carcopino, "Enfants," = J. Carcopino, "Survivances des Sacrifices d'Enfants dans l'Afrique Romaine," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, Vol. 106 (1932), pp. 592-599.

Cassuto, *Adam* = U. D. Cassuto, *Meadam ad Noach* (Jerusalem, 1959).

Cassuto, *Anat* = U. D. Cassuto, *Haelah Anat* (Jerusalem, 1965).

Cassuto, "Baal Berit," = U. D. Cassuto, "Baal Berit," *Encyclopedia Miqrait*, Vol. 2 (Jerusalem, 1954), p. 286.

Cassuto, "El Elyon," = U. D. Cassuto, "El Elyon," *Encyclopedia Miqrait*, Vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1955), pp. 288-289.

Cassuto, "El Olam," = U. D. Cassuto , "El Olam," *Encyclopedia Miqrait*, Vol. 1 (Jerusalem, 1955), pp. 287.

Cassuto, "Zeus Demarous," = U. D. Cassuto, "Zeus Demarous in Ugaritic Literature," in *B. Dinaburg Memorial Volume* (Jerusalem, תשי), pp. 65-67.

Cazelles, "Ideologie Royale," = H. Cazelles, "De L'Ideologie Royale," *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University*, Vol. 5 (1973), pp. 59-73.

Chabot, "Punica," = M. Chabot, "Punica," *Journal Asiatique*, Vol. 10 (1917), pp. 5-79.

Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* = R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1903).

Charroux, *Maîtres du Monde* = R. Charroux, *Le Livre des Maîtres du Monde* (Paris, 1967).

Chehab, "Tyr," = M. Chehab, "Tyr à l'époque Romaine," *Mélanges de l'Université St. Joseph*, Vol. 38 (1962), pp. 13-40.

Cheyne, "Esau & Usoos," = T. K. Cheyne, "The Connection of Esau and Usoos," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Vol. 17 (1897), p. 189.

Clagett, *Greek Science* = M. Clagett, *Greek Science in Antiquity* (New York, 1966).

Clapham = L. R. Clapham, *Sanchuniathon: The First Two Cycles* (Unpublished Dissertation, Harvard University, 1969).

Clemen = C. Clemen, *Die Phönikische Religion nach Philon von Byblos*, in *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, Vol. 42, 3 (1939).

Clemen, *Lukian's Schrift* = C. Clemen, *Lukian's Schrift über die Syrische Göttin*, in *Der Alte Orient*, Vol. 37,4 (1938).

Collart, *Varron* = J. Collart, *Varron, De Lingua Latina V* (Paris, 1952).

Contenau, *Everyday Life* = G. Contenau, *Everyday Life in Babylonia and Assyria* (New York, 1966).

Cook, *Zeus* = A. D. Cook, *Zeus* (Cambridge, 1914-40).

Cooke, *Textbook* = G. Cooke, *A Textbook of North-Semitic Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1903).

Cross, *Canaanite Myth* = F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, 1973).

Cross, "Phoenician Incantations," = F. M. Cross, "Phoenician Incantations on a Plaque of the Seventh Century B.C. from Arslan Tash," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Vol. 197 (1970), pp. 42-49.

Cross, *Studies* = F. M. Cross, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*, (Unpublished Diss. John Hopkins, 1950).

Cross, "Yahweh and the Patriarchs," = F. M. Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 55 (1962), pp. 236-241.

Cumberland = R. Cumberland, *Sanchuniathon's Phoenician History* (London, 1720).

Cumont, "Cultes Solaires," = F. Cumont, "Deux Monuments des Cultes Solaires," *Syria*, Vol. 14 (1933), pp. 381-395.

Cumont, "Deux Autels," = F. Cumont, "Deux Autels de Phénicie," *Syria* Vol. 8 (1927), pp. 163-168.

Cumont, "Eshmun," = F. Cumont, "Eshmun," *RE* Vol. 11, Cols. 676-679.

Cumont, "Gennaios," = F. Cumont, "Gennaios," *RE* Vol. 7, Col. 1174.

Dahood, "ASD," = M. Dahood, "Ancient Semitic Deities in Syria and Palestine," in S. Moscati (Ed.), *Le antiche Divinita Semitiche* (Rome, 1958), pp. 65-94.

DK = H. Diels and W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (Zurich, 1966 Reprint).

Dahood, *Psalms* = M. Dahood, *Psalms* (Garden City, 1966-70).

Danielou, "Mauvais Gouvernement," = J. Danielou, "Le Mauvais Gouvernement du Monde d'après le Gnosticisme," in U. Bianchi, *Le Origine dello Gnosticismo* (Leiden, 1967), pp. 448-459.

Delatte & Derchain, *Intailles* = A. Delatte and Ph. Derchain, *Les Intailles Magiques Gréco-égyptiennes* (Paris, 1964).

Della Vida, "El Elyon," = R. Della Vida, "El Elyon in Gen. 14:18-20," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 63 (1944), pp. 1-9.

Denniston, "Dedication," = J. Denniston, "Dedication," *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford, 1949), pp. 259-260.

Devreese, *Manuscrites Grecs* = R. Devreese, *Introduction à l'Étude des Manuscrites Grecs* (Paris, 1954).

DeVaux, "Canaan," = R. DeVaux, "Le Pays de Canaan," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 88 (1968), pp. 23-30.

DeVaux, *Studies* = R. DeVaux, *Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice* (Cardiff, 1964).

Dhorme, "Dagon," = E. Dhorme, "Les Avatars du dieu Dagon," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, Vol. 138 (1950), pp. 129-144.

Dodd, *Bible and Greeks* = C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks* (London, 1954).

Dodwell = H. Dodwell, *A Discourse on Sanchuniathon*, *Appendix* to his *Two Letters of Advice* (London, 1680).

Dornseieff, "Altorientalisches in Hesiod," = F. Dornseieff, "Altorientalisches in Hesiod's Theogonie," *L'Antiquité Classique*, Vol. 6 (1937), pp. 231-258.

Driver, *CML* = G.R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Edinburgh, 1956).

Driver, "Geographical Problems," = G. R. Driver, "Geographical Problems," *Eretz Israel*, Vol. 5 (1958), pp. 16-21*.

Du Cange, *Glossarium* = C. Du Cange, *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis* (Graz, 1954, Reprint).

Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Ancien Dieu," = R. Du Mesnil du Buisson, "L'ancien Dieu Tyrien Ouso," *Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph*, Vol. 41 (1965), pp. 1-29.

Du Mesnil du Buisson, "El," = R. Du Mesnil du Buisson, "El et ses Epouses vus par Philon de Byblos," *Mélanges d'archéologie, d'épigraphie et d'histoire offerts a J. Carcopino* (Paris, 1966), pp. 271-288.

Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Études* = R. Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Études sur les Dieux Phéniciens hérités par l'Empire Romaine* (Leiden, 1970).

Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Le Groupe," = R. Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Le Groupe des Dieux El, Betyle, Dagon et Atlas," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, Vol. 169 (1966), pp. 37-49.

Du Mesnil du Buisson, *NE* = R. Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Nouvelles Études sur les Dieux et les Mythes de Canaan* (Leiden, 1973).

Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Origine," = R. Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Origine et Evolution du Pantheon de Tyr," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, Vol. 164 (1963), pp. 133-163.

Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Zeus Demarous," = R. Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Zeus Demarous père de Melqart d'après Philon de Byblos," *Mélanges Michalowski* (Warsaw, 1966), pp. 553-559.

Dunant, *Sanctuaire de Baalshamin* = C. Dunant, *Le Sanctuaire de Baalshamin à Palmyre, Les Inscriptions* (Neuchatel, 1971).

Dussaud, "Byblos," = R. Dussaud, "Byblos et les Gibilites dans l'Ancient Testament," *Syria* , Vol. 4 (1923), pp. 300-315.

Dussaud, *Découvertes* = R. Dussaud, *Les Découvertes de Ras Shamra (Ugarit) et l'Ancien Testament* (Paris, 1941).

Dussaud, "Écriture," = R. Dussaud, "L'Écriture des Ammonéens," *Syria* Vol. 15 (1934), pp. 297-298.

Dussaud, "Invention," = R. Dussaud, "L'Invention des Hieroglyphes d'après Philon de Byblos," *Mélanges Picard* (Paris, 1949), pp. 334-337.

Dussaud, "Melqart," = R. Dussaud, "Melqart," *Syria* Vol. 25 (1948), pp. 205-230.

Dussaud, "Mythologie Phénicienne," = R. Dussaud, "La Mythologie Phénicienne d'après les Tablettes de Ras Shamra," *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, Vol. 104 (1931), pp. 353-408.

Dussaud, "Theogonie," = R. Dussaud, "Les Antecedents Orientaux de la Theogonie d'Hesiode," *Mélanges Grégoire I* = *AIPHO*, Vol. 9 (1949), pp. 227-231.

Dussaud, "Yahwe," = R. Dussaud, "Yahwe fils de El," *Syria*, Vol. 34 (1957), pp. 232-242.

Ebeling, *Tod und Leben* = E. Ebeling, *Tod und Leben nach den Vorstellungen der Babylonier* (Berlin, 1931).

Edelstein, *Asclepius* = E. J. and L. Edelstein, *Asclepius* (Baltimore, 1945).

Eissfeldt, "Art und Aufbau," = O. Eissfeldt, "Art und Aufbau der Phönizischen Geschichte des Philon von Byblos," *Syria* Vol. 33 (1956), pp. 88-95.

Eissfeldt, "Baalshamin und Jahwe," = O. Eissfeldt, "Baalshamin und Jahwe," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Vol. 57 (1939), pp. 1-31.

Eissfeldt, *Baal Zaphon* = O. Eissfeldt, *Baal Zaphon, Zeus Kasios und der Durchzug der Israeliten durchs Meer* (Halle, 1932).

Eissfeldt, "Bethel," = O. Eissfeldt, "Der Gott Bethel," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Vol. 28 (1930), pp. 1-30.

Eissfeldt, "El and Yahweh," = O. Eissfeldt, "El and Yahweh," *Journal of Semitic Studies*, Vol. 1 (1956), pp. 25-37.

Eissfeldt, *Introduction* = O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament, An Introduction*, Translated from the German by P. Ackroyd (New York, 1965).

Eissfeldt, "Kosmogonie," = O. Eissfeldt, "Phönikische und Griechische Kosmogonie," in *Elements Orientaux dans la Religion Grecque Ancienne*, (Paris, 1960), pp. 1-15.

Eissfeldt, *RS* = O. Eissfeldt, *Ras Shamra und Sanchuniathon*, in *Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte des Altertums*, Heft 4 (1939).

Eissfeldt, *S. von B.* = O. Eissfeldt, *Sanchuniathon von Beirut und Ilimilku von Ugarit*, in *Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte des Altertums*, Heft 5 (1952).

Eissfeldt, *T. und S.* = O. Eissfeldt, *Taautos und Sanchuniathon*, in *Sitzungsberichte der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* (1952), no. 1.

Eissfeldt, "Tabor," = O. Eissfeldt, "Der Gott Tabor," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Vol. 31 (1934), pp. 1-34.

Eissfeldt, "Textkritische Bemerkungen," = O. Eissfelt, "Textkritische Bemerkungen zu den in Eusebius' Praeparatio Evangelicae enthaltenen Fragmenten des Philo von Byblos," *Wiener Studien*, Vol. 70 (1957), pp. 94-99.

Eissfeldt, "Tyros," = O. Eissfeldt, "Tyros," *RE* Second Series, Vol. 7^2, Cols. 1876-1908.

Erman, "Denkmal," = H. Erman, "Ein Denkmal Memphitischer Theologie," in *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1911), pp. 916-950.

Ewald = H. Ewald, "Abhandlungen über die Phönikischen Ansichten von der Weltschöpfung und den Geschichtlichen Wert Sanchuniathon's" *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Vol. 5 (1851), pp. 1-68.

FGrH = F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* (Leiden, 1923-58).

Farnell, *Cults* = L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States* (Oxford, 1896-1909).

Festugière, *Révélation* = A. J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermes Trismegiste* Paris, 1949-54).

Fisher, "Creation," = L. R. Fisher, "Creation at Ugarit and in the Old Testament," *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. 15 (1965), pp. 313-324.

Fitzmeyer, *Gen. Apoc. Qumran* = J. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I* (Rome, 1971, Revised Second Edition).

Follet, "Sanchuniathon," = R. Follet, "Sanchuniathon, personnage mythique ou personne historique?" *Biblica*, Vol. 34 (1953), pp. 81-90.

Forrer, "Götterkonigtums," = E. Forrer, "Eine geschichte der Götterkonigtums aus dem Hatti-Reich," *Mélanges Franz Cumont* = *AIPHO* 4 (1936), pp. 687-713.

Frankfort, *BP* = H. Frankfort et. al., *Before Philosophy* (Aylesburg, 1959).

Frazier, *Golden Bough* = J. G. Frazier, *The Golden Bough*, Edited with notes by T. H. Gaster (Garden City, 1961).

Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien* = J. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien* (Breslau, 1875).

Fulco, *The Canaanite God Resep* = W. J. Fulco, *The Canaanite God Resep* (New Haven, 1976).

Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar* = A. Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar* (Oxford, 1969).

Gaisford, *Suidae Lexicon* = T. Gaisford, *Suidae Lexicon Graece et Latine* (Halle, 1852).

Garbini, "Iscrizioni," = A. Garbini, "Le Iscrizioni puniche di Antas," *Annali Istituto Orientale di Napoli*, Vol. 19 (1969), pp. 317-331.

Gaster, *Thespis* = T. H. Gaster, *Thespis* (Garden City, 1961).

Court de Gebelin, *Allegories Orientales* = M. Court de Gebelin, *Allegories Orientales ou le fragment de Sanchuniathon* (Paris, 1773).

Gese, *Religionen Altsyriens* = H. Gese, *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens, und der Mandaer* (Stuttgart, 1970).

Gifford, *Eusebii Pamphili* = E. H. Gifford, *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis Libri XV* (Oxford, 1903).

Gifford, *Eusebius* = E. H. Gifford, *Eusebius, Preparation of the Gospel* (Oxford, 1903).

Ginsberg, "Anath," = H. L. Ginsberg, "Did Anath fight the Dragon," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Vol. 84 (1941), pp. 12-14.

Ginsberg, "Anath and Aqhat," = H. L. Ginsberg, "The North Canaanite Epic of Anath and Aqhat," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Vol. 98 (1945), pp. 15-23.

Ginsberg, "Milon," = H. L. Ginsberg, "Lemilon Leshon Hamiqra," *Yallon Festschrift* (Jerusalem, 1963), pp. 167-173.

Ginsberg, "Reflexes of Sargon," = H. L. Ginsberg, "Reflexes of Sargon in Isaiah after 715 B.C.E.," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 88 (1968), pp. 47-54.

Ginsberg, "Ugaritic Studies," = H. L. Ginsberg, "Ugaritic Studies and the Bible," in D. N. Freedman & E. F. Campbell (Eds.), *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader, 2* (New York, 1964), pp. 34-50.

Ginzberg, *Legends* = L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1909).

Gordon, *UT* = C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (Rome, 1965).

Grant, "Êtres Intermédiaires," = R. M. Grant, "Les Êtres Intermédiaires dans le Judaisme Tardif," in U. Bianchi, *Le Origine dello Gnosticismo* (Leiden, 1967), pp. 141-157.

Greenfield, "Scripture and Inscription," = J. C. Greenfield, "Scripture and Inscription," in H. Goedicke (Ed.), *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of W. F. Albright* (Baltimore, 1971), pp. 253-268.

Gruppe = O. Gruppe, *Die Griechischen Culte und Mythe* (Leipzig, 1887).

Gsell, *Histoire Ancienne* = S. Gsell, *Histoire Ancienne de l'Afrique du Nord* (Paris, 1920).

Gudemann, "Herennius," = A. Gudemann, "Herennius," *RE* Vol. 8, cols. 650-661.

Güterbock, *Kumarbi* = H. G. Güterbock, *Kumarbi* (Istanbul, 1946).

Guthrie, "Cabiri" = W. K. C. Guthrie, "Cabiri," *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford, 1949), pp. 150-151.

Guthrie, *Greeks and their Gods* = W. K. C. Guthrie, *The Greeks and their Gods* (Boston, 1956).

Guthrie, *ITB* = W. K. C. Guthrie, *In the Beginning* (Ithaca, 1965).

Gutschmid, *KS* = A. von Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften* (Leipzig, 1889).

Habil, "Yahweh," = N.C. Habil, "Yahweh Maker of Heaven and Earth," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 91 (1972), pp. 321-327.

Halevy, "Photos et Mot," = J. Halevy, "Les Principes Cosmogoniques Phéniciens Pothos et Mot," *Mélanges de Critique et d'Histoire*, (Paris, 1883), pp. 381-388.

Harris, *Development* = Z. S. Harris, *Development of the Canaanite Dialects* (New Haven, 1939).

Harris, *Grammar* = Z. S. Harris, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language* (New Haven, 1936).

Helck, *Beziehungen* = W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien* (Wiesbaden, 1971).

Held, "Additional Pairs," = M. Held, "Additional Pairs of Words in Synonymous Parallelism," *Leshonenu* Vol. 18 (1953), pp. 145-160.

Held, "Azitawadda," = M. Held, "Azitawadda in the Light of Old Babylonian Royal Inscriptions," (in press).

Held, "Factitive-Passive," = M. Held, "The Factitive-Passive Sequence of Identical Verbs," *Journal of Biblical Literature* Vol. 84 (1965), pp. 272-282.

Held, "Pits and Pitfalls," = M. Held, "Pits and Pitfalls in Akkadian and Biblical Hebrew," *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University*, Vol. 5 (1973), pp. 173-190.

Held, "YQTL," = M. Held, "The YQTL-QTL Sequence of Identical Verbs," in M. Ben Horin (Ed.), *Studies and Essays in honor of A. A. Neuman* (Philadelphia, 1967), pp. 281-291.

Held, "Zbl/sbl," = M. Held, "The Root of Zbl/sbl in Akkadian, Ugaritic and

Biblical Hebrew," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* Vol. 88 (1968), pp. 90-96.

Henry, *Eusebe et Plotin* = P. Henry, *Recherches sur la Préparation Evangélique d'Eusèbe et l'Edition Perdue des Œuvres de Plotin*, (Paris, 1935).

Hill, *BMC Phoenicia* = G. F. Hill, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Phoenicia* (London, 1910).

Hinnells, "Reflections," = J. Hinnells, "Reflections on the Bull Slaying Scene," in J. Hinnells (Ed.), *Mithraic Studies* (Manchester, 1971), Vol. 2, pp. 290-312.

Hirschfeld, "Attischen Kunstlerinschriften," = G. Hirschfeld, "Nachträge zu den Attischen Kunstlerinschriften," *Archäologische Zeitung*, N.S., Vol. 5 (1873), pp. 19-29.

Höfer, "Io," = O. Höfer, "Io," Roscher, *Lexicon*, Vol. 2^1, cols. 263-279.

Höfer, "Pothos," = O. Höfer, "Pothos," Roscher, *Lexicon*, Vol. 3^2, cols. 2903-2906.

Höfer, "Semesilam," = O. Höfer, "Semesilam," Roscher, *Lexicon*, Vol. 4, col. 677.

Hölscher, "Anaximander," = U. Hölscher, "Anaximander und die Anfänge der Philosophie," *Hermes* Vol. 81 (1953), pp. 257-277 & 385-418.

How & Wells = W. W. How & J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus* (Oxford, 1928).

Humbert, "Asher," = P. Humbert, "Une mention d'Asher dans les sources de Philon de Byblos," *RES* (1941), pp. 61-66.

Hvidberg-Hansen, "Baal Malage," = O. Hvidberg-Hansen, "Baal Malage," *Acta Orientalia*, Vol. 35 (1973), pp. 57-81.

IGLS = J. Jalabert, R. Mouterde et. al., *Inscriptions Grecques et Latines de la Syrie* (Paris, 1929-).

Ingholt, "Hamman," = M. Ingholt, "Le Sens du Mot Hamman," in *Mélanges Dussaud* (Paris, 1939), pp. 795-802.

Iriarte = J. Iriarte, *Regiae Bibliothecae Matritensis Codices Graeci* (Madrid, 1769).

Jacoby, *Appollodors Chronik* = F. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik*, *Philologische Untersuchungen* Vol. 16 (1902).

Jacoby, "Euemeros," = F. Jacoby, "Euemeros," *RE* Vol. 6, cols. 952-972.

Jaeger, *Theology* = W. Jaeger, *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers* (Oxford, 1967).

Jenni, *Olam* = E. S. Jenni, *Das Wort olam im Alten Testaments* (Basel, 1953).

Jensen, "Royal Purple," = L. B. Jensen, "Royal Purple of Tyre," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 22 (1963), pp. 104-118.

Jonas, *Gnostic Religion* = J. Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion* (Boston, 1963).

KAI = H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanaische und Aramaische Inschriften* (Wiesbaden, 1964-66).

K & R = G. S. Kirk and J. E. Raven, *The Pre-Socratic Philosophers* (Cambridge, 1963).

Kahn, *Anaximander* = C. Kahn, *Anaximander and the Origins of Greek Cosmology* (New York, 1960).

Kapelrud, *Baal* = A. S. Kapelrud, *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts* (Copenhagen, 1952).

Katz, "Septuagintal Studies," = P. Katz, "Septuagintal Studies at Mid-Century," in W. Davies & D. Daube (Eds.), *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology* (Cambridge, 1956), pp. 176-208.

Katzenstein, "Tyre," = H. J. Katzenstein, "Tyre in the El-Amarna Letters," *Praqim*, Vol. 1 (1967/8), pp. 115-129.

Kaufmann, *Religion* = Y. Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel*, Translated from the Hebrew by M. Greenberg (Chicago, 1960).

Keller, *Antike Tierwelt* = O. Keller, *Die Antike Tierwelt* (Leipzig, 1909-13).

Kenyon, *Books and Readers* = F. G. Kenyon, *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Oxford, 1932).

Kern, *OF* = O. Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta* (Berlin, 1922).

Kuster, *Suidae Lexicon* = L. Kuster, *Suidae Lexicon* (Cambridge, 1705).

LCL = Loeb Classical Library.

Labriolle, *Réaction Paienne* = P. de Labriolle, *La Réaction Paienne* (Paris, 1934).

Lack, "Elyon," = R. Lack, "Les Origines de Elyon," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* Vol. 24 (1962), pp. 44-64.

Lackeit, "Aion," = R. Lackeit, "Aion," *RE Supplement* 3, col. 66.

Lagrange = M. J. Lagrange, *Etudes sur les Religions Sémitiques* (Paris, 1903).

Lambert & Walcot, "Babylonian Theogony," = W. G. Lambert and P. Walcot, "A New Babylonian Theogony and Hesiod," *Kadmos*, Vol. 4 (1965), pp. 64-72.

Lampe, *Patristic Lexicon* = G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1961).

Leglay, *Saturne Africain* = J. Leglay, *Saturne Africain, Histoire* (Paris, 1966).

Leipoldt & Morenz, *Heilige Schriften* = J. Leipoldt & S. Morenz, *Heilige Schriften* (Leipzig, 1953).

Leisegang, *Gnosis* = H. Leisegang, *Die Gnosis* (Stuttgart, 1955).

Lenschau, "Semiramis," = T. Lenschau, "Semiramis," *RE Supplement 7*, Cols. 1204-1212.

Lesky = A. Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature*, tr. from the German by C. de Heer and J. A. Willis (London, 1966).

Levy, *Olamot* = H. Levy, *Olamot Nifgashim* (Jerusalem, 1960).

Lewy, "Husarum," = J. Lewy, "Old Assyrian *Husarum* and Sanchunyaton's Story about Chusor," *Israel Exploration Journal* Vol. 5 (1955), pp. 154-162.

Lipinski, "El's Abode," = J. Lipinski, "El's Abode," *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica*, Vol. 2 (1971), pp. 13-69.

Lipinski, "Skn et sgn," = E. Lipinski, "Skn et sgn dans le sémitique occidental du Nord," *Ugarit Forschungen* Vol. 5 (1973), pp. 191-207.

Littleton, "KIH Theme," = C. S. Littleton, "The Kingship in Heaven Theme," in J. Puhvel (Ed.), *Myth and Law Among the Indo-Europeans* (Berkeley, 1970), pp. 83-121.

Littleton, "Kingship in Heaven," = C. S. Littleton, "Is the Kingship in Heaven theme Indo-European," in G. Gardona et al., *Indo European and Indo-Europeans* (Philadelphia, 1970), pp. 383-404.

Liveriani, "Sydyk e Misor," = M. Liveriani, "Sydyk e Misor," in *Studi ... E. Voltera* (Rome, 1969), pp. 55-74.

Lobeck = C. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus* (Darmstadt, 1961, Reprint).

Loewenstamm, *Exodus* = S. E. Loewenstamm, *The Tradition of the Exodus in its Development* (Jerusalem, 1965).

Loewenstamm, "Myth of the Sea," = S. Loewenstamm, "The Myth of the Sea in Ugaritic Literature and in the Bible," *Eretz Israel*, Vol. 9 (1969), pp. 96-101.

Loewenstamm, "Philon," = S. E. Loewenstamm, "Philon Migval," *Praqim*, Vol. 2 (1971), pp. 315-327.

Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," = F. Lokkegaard, "Some Comments on the Sanchuniathon Tradition," *Studia Theologica*, Vol. 8 (1954), pp. 51-76.

Lukas, "Das Ei," = F. Lukas, "Das Ei als kosmogonische Vorstellung," *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde*, Vol. 4 (1894), pp. 227-243.

Margulis, "Ugaritic Psalm," = B. Margulis, "A Ugaritic Psalm," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 89 (1970), pp. 292-304.

Mariette, *Abydos* = A. Mariette, *Catalogue General des Monuments d'Abydos* (Paris, 1880).

Mariette, *Denderah* = A. Mariette, *Denderah* (Paris, 1870-75).

Masson-Sznycer, *Recherches* = O. Masson & M. Sznycer, *Recherches sur les Pheniciens a Chypre* (Paris-Geneva, 1972).

McCarthy, "Creation," = D. J. McCarthy, "Creation Motifs in Ancient Hebrew Poetry," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol. 29 (1967), pp. 393-406.

McCasland, "Religious Healing," = S. McCasland, "Religious Healing in First Century Palestine," in T. McNeill et. al. (Eds.), *Environmental Factors in Christian History* (Chicago, 1939), pp. 18-34.

McKay, "Helel," = J. W. McKay, "Helel and the Dawn Goddess," *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. 20 (1970), pp. 451-464.

McKenzie, *Second Isaiah* = J. McKenzie, *Second Isaiah* (Garden City, 1968).

Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien* = B. Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien* (Heidelberg, 1925).

Mercer, *EA Tablets* = S. B. Mercer, The *Tel-el-Amarna Tablets* (Toronto, 1939).

Meyer, *GdA* = E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* (Basel, 1953).

Milik, "Cultes," = J. T. Milik, "Les Papyrus Araméens d'Hermopolis et les Cultes Syro-phéniciens," *Biblica*, Vol. 48 (1967), pp. 546-622.

Milik, *Dedicaces* = J. T. Milik, *Dedicaces faites par des Dieux* (Paris, 1972).

Milik, *Enoch, Aramaic Fragments* = J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch, Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford, 1976).

Miller, "El," = P. D. Miller, "El the Warrior," *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol 60 (1967), pp. 411-431.

Miller, "Fire," = P. D. Miller, "Fire in the Mythology of Canaan and Israel," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol. 27 (1965), pp. 256-261.

Montgomery, "The Highest Heaven," = J. A. Montgomery, "The Highest, Heaven, Aion, Time, etc. in Semitic Religion," *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 31 (1938), pp. 143-150.

Moor, "Studies I," = J. C. de Moor, "Studies in the New Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra I," *Ugarit Forschungen*, Vol. 2 (1970), pp. 187-228.

Moor, "Studies II," = J. C. de Moor, "Studies in the New Alphabetic Texts from Ras Shamra II," *Ugarit Forschungen*, Vol. 2 (1970), pp. 303-327.

Morey, *Mosaics* = C. R. Morey, *The Mosaics of Antioch* (New York, 1938).

Moscati, *Comp. Grammar* = S. Moscati, *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (Wiesbaden, 1969).

Moscati, *Phoenicians* = S. Moscati, *The World of the Phoenicians* (London, 1968).

Moulten & Turner, *NT Greek* = J. H. Moulten and N. Turner, *A Grammar of the New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh, 1963).

Movers = F. C. Movers, *Die Phönizer* (Bonn, 1841).

Mowan, "Quattuor Montes," = O. Mowan, "Quattuor Montes Sacri in Ps. 89:13," *Verbum Domini*, Vol. 41 (1963), pp. 11-20.

Mras, *Praeparatio Evangelica* = K. Mras, *Die Praeparatio Evangelica* (Berlin, 1954).

Mras, "Sanchuniathon," = K. Mras, "Sanchuniathon," *Anzeiger der Osterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, Vol. 89 (1952), pp. 175-186.

Muhly, "Astour," = J. Muhly, Review of Astour, *HS*, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 85 (1965), p. 586.

Mulder, "Oldenburg," = M. J. Mulder, Review of Oldenburg, *Conflict*, *Ugarit Forschungen*, Vol. 2 (1970), pp. 359-366.

Muller, *FHG* = C. Muller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* (Paris, 1883).

Muller, "Wagenfeld," = K. Muller, Review of Wagenfeld, *Sanchuniathon*, *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (1837,52), pp. 507-517.

Murtonen, *Philological Treatise* = A. Murtonen, *A Philological Treatise on the Old Testament Divine Names* (1952).

Musurillo, *Acts* = H. J. Musurillo, *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs* (Oxford, 1954).

NDM = S. Sauneron et. al., *La Naissance du Monde*, in *Sources Orientales* Vol. 1, (1959).

NE = M. Lidzbarski, *Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik* (Weimar, 1898).

NEB = *The New English Bible* (Oxford-Cambridge, 1970).

NJPS = *The Torah, the Five Books of Moses, A New Translation* (Philadelphia, 1962).

Nagel, "Thoth," = G. Nagel, "Le Dieu Thoth d'après les Textes Egyptiens," *Eranos-Jahrbuch*, Vol. 9 (1942), pp. 109-140.

Nautin = P. Nautin, "Sanchuniathon chez Philon de Byblos et chez Porphyre," *Revue Biblique*, Vol. 56 (1949), pp. 259-273.

Nautin, "Valeur Documentaire," = P. Nautin, "La Valeur Documentaire de l'Histoire Phénicienne," *Revue Biblique*, Vol. 56 (1949), pp. 573-578.

Naveh, "Aramaica Dubiosa," = J. Naveh, "Aramaica Dubiosa," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 27 (1968), pp. 317-325.

Niese, *Stephani Byzantii* = B. Niese, *De Stephani Byzantii Auctoribus* (Killia, 1873).

Nilsson = M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion* (Munich, 1961).

Nock, "Vision," = A. D. Nock, "A Vision of Mandulis Aion," *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 27 (1934), pp. 55ff.

Nöldeke, "Inscriptions," = Th. Nöldeke, Review of N. Davis, *Inscriptions in Phoenician Characters in the British Museum*, in *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft zu Göttingen* (1863), pp. 1827-1835.

Noth, *IPN* = M. Noth, *Die Israelitischen Personennamen* (Stuttgart, 1928).

Noth, *Uberlieferung* = M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (Halle, 1943).

Oden, "Philo of Byblos," = R. A. Oden Jr., "Philo of Byblos and Hellenistic Historiography," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, Vol. 110 (1978), pp. 115-126.

Oldenburg, *Conflict* = U. Oldenburg, *The Conflict between El and Baal* (Leiden, 1969).

Oppenheim, "Mesopotamian Mythology," = A. Leo Oppenheim, "Notes on Mesopotamian Mythology," *Orientalia*, Vol. 16 (1947), pp. 207-238.

Orelli = J. C. Orelli, *Sanchuniathonis Berytii quae feruntur Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1826).

Orlinsky, *New Translation* = H. M. Orlinsky, *Notes on the New Translation of the Torah* (Philadelphia, 1970).

PL = J. P. Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Latina* (Paris, 1844-80).

PGM = K. Preisendanz, *Papyri Graecae Magicae* (Leipzig, 1928-31).

Parente, "Troiani," = F. Parente, Review of Troiani, *Rivista di Filologia* Vol. 103 (1975), pp. 216-218.

PRE = Pirqei Rabbi Eliezer.

Peckham, *Development* = J. B. Peckham, *The Development of the Late Phoenician Scripts* (Cambridge, 1968).

Pétrement, "Sept Archontes," = S. Pétrement, "Le Mythe des Sept Archontes Createurs peut-il s'expliquer à partir du Christianisme," in U. Bianchi, *Le Origine dello Gnosticismo* (Leiden, 1967), pp. 460-487.

Pfeiffer, *NT Times* = R. H. Pfeiffer, *A History of New Testament Times* (New York, 1949).

Picard, "Sanchuniathon," = C. Picard, "Sanchuniathon d'après Philon de Byblos et Porphyre," *Revue Archéologique*, Series 6, Vol. 35 (1950), pp. 122-123.

Pope, *El* = M. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts* (Leiden, 1955).

Pope, *Job* = M. Pope, *Job* (Garden City, 1965).

Pope & Röllig, "Syrien," = M. Pope & W. Röllig, "Syrien," in *Wörterbuch der Mythologie* (Stuttgart, 1965), Vol. 1, pp. 219-312.

Pope & Tigay, "Description," = M. Pope & J. Tigay, "A Description of Baal," *Ugarit Forschungen*, Vol. 3 (1971), pp. 117-130.

Porten, *Elephantine* = B. Porten, *Archives from Elephantine* (Berkeley, 1968).

Posener, *Princes et Pays* = G. Posener, *Princes et Pays d'Asie et Nubie* (Brussels, 1940).

Rabin, *Zadokite Documents* = C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford, 1958).

Rabbinovicz, *Diqduqei Sofrim* = R. Rabbinovicz, *Diqduqei Sofrim* (New York, 1960, Reprint).

Reed, *Asherah* = W. L. Reed, *The Asherah in the Old Testament* (Fort Worth, 1949).

Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* = R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* (Leipzig, 1904).

Renan = E. Renan, "Mémoire sur l'origine et caractère véritable de l'Histoire Phénicienne qui porte le nom de Sanchuniathon," *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belle-Lettres*, Vol. 23 (1868), pp. 241-334.

Robertson, *Linguistic Evidence* = D. A. Robertson, *Linguistic Evidence in Dating Early Hebrew Poetry*, SBL Dissertation Series, Vol. 3 (Missoula, 1972).

Rofé, *Emunah Bemalachim* = A. Rofé, *Haemunah Bemalachim Beyisrael* (Jerusalem, 1969).

Rohde, *KS* = E. Rohde, *Kleine Schriften* (Leipzig, 1901).

Roscher, *Lexicon* = W. H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexicon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie* (Hildesheim, 1965, Reprint).

Rose, *Handbook* = H. J. Rose, *A Handbook of Greek Mythology* (London, 1965).

Rose, "Idaean Dactyls," = H. J. Rose, "Idaean Dactyls," *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford, 1949), p. 449.

Rosenberg, "Sedeq," = R. M. Rosenberg, "The God Sedeq," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, Vol. 36 (1965), pp. 161-177.

Ross, "Prophecy," = J. Ross, "Prophecy: Hamath, Israel, Mari," *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 63 (1970), pp. 1-28.

Rothenberg, *Timna* = B. Rothenberg, *Timna* (London, 1962).

SVF = H. von Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1905-1924).

Sambursky, *Physics of the Stoics* = S. Sambursky, *Physics of the Stoics* (London, 1959).

Scaliger, *Emend. Temporum* = J. J. Scaliger, *Opus Novum ... De Emendatione Temporum* (Paris, 1583).

Schaeffer, "El et Baal," = C. F. A. Schaeffer, "Témoignages des Cultes de El et Baal," *Syria*, Vol. 43 (1966), pp. 1-19.

Schaublin, "Diodor von Tarsus," = C. Schaublin, "Diodor von Tarsus gegen Porphyrios," *Museum Helveticum*, Vol. 27 (1970), pp. 58-63.

Schlumberger, "Pretendu Dieu Genneas," = D. Schlumberger, "Le Prétendu Dieu Genneas," *Mélanges de L'Université St. Joseph*, Vol. 46 (1970-71), pp. 209-222.

Schnabel, *Berossus* = P. Schnabel, *Berossus und die Babylonisch-Hellenistische Literatur* (Hildesheim, 1968, Reprint).

Schöne, *Eusebius* = A. Schöne, *Eusebius Chronikon* (Berlin, 1866).

Schöne, "Untersuchungen Sappho," = A. Schöne, "Untersuchungen über das

Leben der Sappho," in *Symbola Philologorum Bonnensium in honorem F. Ritschelii Collecta* (Leipzig, 1864-67), pp. 731-762.

Schröder, *Sprache* = P. Schröder, *Die Phönizische Sprache* (Halle, 1869).

Schwabl, "Griechischen Theogonien," = H. Schwabl, "Die Griechischen Theogonien und der Orient," in *Eléments Orientaux dans la Religion Grecque Ancienne* (Paris, 1960), pp. 39-56.

Schwabl, "Weltschöpfung," = H. Schwabl, "Weltschöpfung," *RE Supplement* 9, cols. 1433-1582.

Scott, *Hermetica* = W. Scott, *Hermetica* (Oxford, 1925).

Segal, *Ben Sira* = M. H. Segal, *Sefer Ben Sira Hashalem* (Jerusalem, 1953).

Sethe, *Amun* = K. Sethe, *Amun und die acht Urgötter von Hermopolis* (Berlin, 1924).

Seyrig, "AS 30," = H. Seyrig, "Antiquités Syriennes 30, Inscriptions," *Syria*, Vol. 20 (1939), pp. 302-323.

Seyrig, "AS 39," = H. Seyrig, "Antiquités Syriennes 39, Heracles-Nergal," *Syria*, Vol. 24 (1944-45), pp. 62-80.

Seyrig, "AS 78," = H. Seyrig, "Antiquités Syriennes 78, Les Dieux d'Hieropolis," *Syria*, Vol. 37 (1960), pp. 233-251.

Seyrig, "AS 82," = H. Seyrig, "Antiquités Syriennes 82, Une Idole Betylique," *Syria*, Vol. 40 (1963), pp. 17-19.

Seyrig, "AS 83," = H. Seyrig, "Antiquités Syriennes 83, Les Grands Dieux de Tyr," *Syria*, Vol. 40 (1963), pp. 19-28.

Seyrig, "AS 93," = H. Seyrig, "Antiquités Syriennes 93, Bel de Palmyre," *Syria*, Vol. 48 (1971), pp. 85-114.

Seyrig, "AS 95," = H. Seyrig, "Antiquités Syriennes 95, Le Culte du Soleil en Syrie à l'époque Romaine," *Syria*, Vol. 48 (1971), pp. 337-373.

Seyrig, "Sync. Solaire," = H. Seyrig, "Le Prétendu Syncrétisme Solaire Syrien et le Culte de Sol Invictus," *Bibliothèque des Centres d'Etudes Supérieures Spécialisés. Travaux du Centre d'Histoire des Religions de Strasbourg. Les Syncrétismes dans les Religions Grecque et Romaine* (Paris, 1973).

Seyrig & Starcky, "Genneas," = H. Seyrig & J. Starcky, "Genneas," *Syria*, Vol. 26 (1949), pp. 231-257.

Sherwin-White, *Letters* = A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny* (Oxford, 1966).

Skehan, "Song of Moses, Qumran," = P. W. Skehan. "A Fragment of the Song of Moses (Deut. 32) from Qumran," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Vol. 136 (1953), pp. 12-15.

Smallwood, *Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian* = E. M. Smallwood, *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian* (Cambridge, 1966).

Smith, "Aretalogies," = M. Smith, "Prolegomena to a discussion of Aretalogies, Divine men, the Gospels and Jesus," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 90 (1971), pp. 174-199.

Smith, "Burning Babies," = M. Smith, "A Note on Burning Babies," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 95 (1975), pp. 477-479.

Smith, "Present State," = M. Smith, "The Present State of Old Testament Studies," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 88 (1969), pp. 19-35.
Speiser, *Genesis* = E. A. Speiser, *Genesis* (Garden City, 1964).
Speiser, "Phoinikes," = E. A. Speiser, "The Name Phoinikes," *Language*, Vol. 12 (1936), pp. 121-126.
Speyer, *Bücherfunde* = W. Speyer, *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike*, *Hypomnemata* 24 (1970).
Spiegel, "NDJ," = S. Spiegel, "Noah, Danel, and Job," *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume* (1945), pp. 305-355.
Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte* = W. Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte über Welt, Kultur und Götter* (Basel, 1959).
Starcky, "Dedicace Palmyrienne," = J. Starcky, "Autour d'une Dedicace Palmyrienne," *Syria*, Vol. 26 (1949), pp. 43-85.
Starcky, "Palmyre," = J. Starcky, "Palmyre," *Supplement au Dictionnaire de la Bible* Vol. 6, cols. 1066-1104.
Steiner, *Sukzessionsmythos* = G. Steiner, *Der Sukzessionsmythos in Hesiod und ihren Orientalischen Parallelen* (Unpublished Dissertation, Hamburg, 1958).
Tallqvist, *Götterepitheta* = K. L. Tallqvist, *Akkadische Götterepitheta* (Helsinki, 1938).
Teixidor, "BES 1967," = J. Teixidor, "Bulletin d'Epigraphie Sémitique 1967," *Syria*, Vol. 44 (1967), pp. 163-194
Teixidor, "BES 1968," = J. Teixidor, "Bulletin d'Epigraphie Sémitique, 1968," *Syria*, Vol. 45 (1968), pp. 353-389.
Teixidor, "BES 1969," = J. Teixidor, "Bulletin d'Epigraphie Sémitique, 1969," *Syria*, Vol. 46 (1969), pp. 319-338.
Teixidor, "BES 1970," = J. Teixidor, "Bulletin d'Epigraphie Sémitique, 1970," *Syria*, Vol. 47 (1970), pp. 357-389.
Teixidor, "BES 1971," = J. Teixidor, "Bulletin d'Epigraphie Sémitique, 1971," *Syria*, Vol. 48 (1971), pp. 453-493.
Teixidor, "BES 1972," = J. Teixidor, "Bulletin d'Epigraphie Sémitique, 1972," *Syria*, Vol. 49 (1972), pp. 413-449.
Teixidor, "BES 1973," = J. Teixidor, "Bulletin d'Epigraphie Sémitique, 1973," *Syria*, Vol. 50 (1973), pp. 401-442.
Teixidor, "BES 1974," = J. Teixidor, "Bulletin d'Epigraphie Sémitique, 1974," *Syria*, Vol. 51 (1974), pp. 299-340.
Teixidor, "BES 1975," = J. Teixidor, "Bulletin d'Epigraphie Sémitique, 1975," *Syria*, Vol. 52 (1975), pp. 261-295.
Teixidor, "BES 1976," = J. Teixidor, "Bulletin d'Epigraphie Sémitique 1976," *Syria*, Vol. 53 (1976), pp. 305-341.
Teixidor, "BES 1977," = J. Teixidor, "Bulletin d'Epigraphie Sémitique 1977," *Syria*, Vol. 54 (1977), pp. 251-276.
Teixidor, "Madrid Papyrus," = J. Teixidor, "On the Authenticity of the Madrid Papyrus," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 31 (1972), pp. 340-342.
Teixidor, "Nouveau Papyrus," = J. Teixidor, "Un Nouveau Papyrus Araméen du Règne de Darius II," *Syria*, Vol. 46 (1969), pp. 285-290.

Teixidor, *The Pagan God* = J. Teixidor, *The Pagan God* (Princeton, 1977).

Thureau-Dangin, "Iahdunlim," = F. Thureau-Dangin, "Iahdunlim, Roi de Hama," *Revue d'Assyrologie*, Vol. 33 (1936), pp. 49-54.

Torrey, "God of Sarepta," = C. C. Torrey, "The Exiled God of Sarepta," *Berytus*, Vol. 9 (1948), pp. 45-49.

Troiani = L. Troiani, *L'Opera Storiografica di Filone da Byblos* (Pisa, 1974).

Vallauri, *Evemero* = G. Vallauri, *Evemero di Messene* (Turin, 1956).

Van Selms, *Marriage* = A. van Selms, *Marriage and Family Life in Ugaritic Literature* (London, 1954).

Vian, *Guerre des Géants* = F. Vian, *La Guerre des Géants* (Paris, 1952).

Vian, "Mythe de Typhée," = F. Vian, "La Mythe de Typhée," in *Eléments Orientaux dans la Religion Grecque Ancienne* (Paris, 1960), pp. 17-37.

Vincent, "Helène à Samarie," = R. Vincent, "Le Culte d'Hélène à Samarie," *Revue Biblique*, Vol. 45 (1936), pp. 221-232.

Virolleaud, "Déchiffrement," = C. Virolleaud, "Le Déchiffrement des tablettes de Ras Shamra," *Syria*, Vol. 12 (1931), pp. 15-23.

Virolleaud, "Nouveau Chant," = C. Virolleaud, "Un Nouveau Chant de Poème d'Alein-Baal," *Syria*, Vol. 13 (1932), pp. 113-163.

Visser, *Götter und Kulte* = E. Visser, *Götter und Kulte im Ptolemaischen Alexandrie* (Amsterdam, 1938).

Von Rad, *Deuteronomy* = G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy* (Philadelphia, 1966).

Von Soden, *AHw* = W. von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* (Wiesbaden, 1959).

Wagenfeld, *Sanchuniathon* = F. Wagenfeld, *Sanchuniathonis Historiarum Phoenicae Libros Novem* (Bremen, 1837).

Walcot, *Hesiod* = P. Walcot, *Hesiod and the Near East* (Cardiff, 1966).

Weber, *Untersuchungen Hadrian* = W. Weber, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus* (Leipzig, 1907).

Weinfeld, "Moloch and the Queen of Heaven," = M. Weinfeld, "The Worship of Moloch and of the Queen of Heaven and its Background," *Ugarit Forschungen*, Vol. 4 (1972), pp. 133-154.

Weinfeld, "Burning Babies," = M. Weinfeld, "Burning Babies in Ancient Israel: A Rejoinder to Morton Smith's Article in JAOS 95 (1975), pp. 477-479," *Ugarit Forschungen*, Vol. 10 (1978), pp. 411-413.

Wellhausen, *Prolegomena* = J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (New York, 1958).

West, *Theogony* = M. L. West, *Hesiod, Theogony* (Oxford, 1966).

Westermann, *BGM* = A. Westermann, *Biographoi Graeci Minores* (Amsterdam, 1974, Reprint).

Wilcken, "Aegyptische Prophetie," = U. Wilcken, "Zur Aegyptische Prophetie," *Hermes*, Vol. 40 (1905), pp. 544-560.

Will, *Korinthiaka* = E. Will, *Korinthiaka* (Paris, 1955).

Will, "Sanctuaire d'Heracles," = E. Will, "Au Sanctuaire d'Heracles à Tyr," *Berytus*, Vol. 10 (1950-51), pp. 1-12.

Williams = P. R. Williams, *A Commentary on Philo Byblius' Phoenician History* (Unpublished Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1968).

Yadin, *Hazor* = Y. Yadin, *Hazor* (Jerusalem, 1958-60).

Zuntz, "Baitylos and Bethel," = G. Zuntz, "Baitylos and Bethel," *Classica et Mediaevalia*, Vol. 8 (1945), pp. 169-219.

CHAPTER ONE

THE MAIN PROBLEMS

i

The fragments of the *Phoenician History* of Philo of Byblos have been frequently studied during the past four centuries.[1] These fragments interested scholars because of their difficulty and obscurity.[2] In addition, from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries they were virtually the sole extra-Biblical evidence concerning the Phoenicians. Scholars realized that the practices and beliefs of the Phoenicians, linguistically and geographically tied to Israel, might shed light on the world of the Bible. Hence they turned to Philo.[3]

Throughout the centuries the central issues have remained unchanged. Philo makes several claims in his work: (1) that he is doing nothing more than translating the work of Sanchuniathon, an ancient author, from Phoenician to Greek; (2) that such Phoenician documents, misappropriated and improperly understood were the sources of Hesiod and much in Greek mythology; and (3) that the most ancient peoples (i.e. the Phoenicians and Egyptians) were Euhemerists and worshipped only human benefactors and the forces of nature. These claims are responsible for the main problems which have dominated the discussion of the *Phoenician History*. What sources did Philo use in composing his work and what were their dates? Did Philo have any very ancient document(s) from which he worked directly? What is the true relationship between Philo's stories and Hesiod? Finally, is Sanchuniathon a historical personality, a legendary hero or religious authority, or a fiction created by Philo or by some prior forger?

---

[1] The earliest study of the fragments to my knowledge was Scaliger's *Emend. Temporum*, in 1583.

[2] The difficulty and obscurity of the text are probably responsible for Philo's having attracted his share of eccentrics. These would include Court de Gebelin, *Allégories Orientales*, Wagenfeld, and Charroux. Wagenfeld is, of course, responsible for the famous forgery of the "complete" text of the *Phoenician History* discussed in the Appendix to Chapter Three. Charroux's *Maîtres du Monde* is perhaps the most interesting, as it was written in 1967. Charroux argues that Philo's Ouranos, Kronos, etc. were visitors to earth from other planets who arrived in rockets or flying saucers, *Maîtres du Monde*, pp. 57-61.

[3] See Eissfeldt, "Art und Aufbau," p. 88.

The history of recent scholarship can be divided into three periods:[4] the first began in the nineteenth century and ended in 1929, the year of the discovery of the Ras Shamra tablets. The second began in 1929 and continued until approximately 1970, when the third and most recent period began.

The scholarly consensus which had been achieved prior to 1929 is well represented by the discussion of Philo in the 1924 edition of Christ-Schmid-Stählin:

> So interessant er ist, so kann er doch mit seinem ausgesprochenen Euhemerismus, seiner Ablehnung natursymbolischer Allegorien, seinem wilden westöstlichen Synkretismus nicht alt sein; vielmehr hat Philo oder dessen Gewährsmann...hellenistisch gefärbte und aus jüngeren Quellen geschöpfte Nachrichten unter dem ehrwürdigen Namen des Sanchuniathon in die Welt geschickt.[5]

It was obvious, virtually from the moment the Ugaritic texts were deciphered, that serious study of these texts would have important consequences for the old Sanchuniathon problem. Virolleaud, in 1931, predicted that the Ugaritic texts should and would force scholars to re-open the Sanchuniathon problem, and would ultimately lead to a more favorable evaluation of Philo's claims.[6] This prediction came true as can be seen from the following evaluation of Philo taken from a more recent handbook of classical literature:

> Philo of Byblos, a Greek speaking litterateur of the Hadrianic period wrote among many other works a *Phoenician History* ... in which he referred to the work of one Sanchuniathon who is alleged to have lived before the Trojan War .... For a long time Philo was reckoned a swindler who had stolen his material from Hesiod's *Theogony*. But a different complexion was put on the case by the appearance in the Ras Shamra tablets—coming from 1400-1200, the times of the alleged Sanchuniathon—of myths and cult texts agreeing with various of Philo's statements.[7]

---

[4] A summary of the historiography can be found in Clemen, pp. 1-15 and in Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, pp. 51-54.

[5] Christ-Schmid-Stählin, Vol. II, 2, p. 868. This passage is quoted as an example of earlier ignorance by Eissfeldt, *RS*, p. 68.

[6] Virolleaud, "Déchiffrement," pp. 21-22.

[7] Lesky, p. 95.

A second factor responsible for the new, more favorable, evaluation of Philo's claims entered the discussion in 1936. In that year, Forrer published fragments of the new Hittite Kumarbi myths from Boghazköi, and proposed that Hesiod's *Theogony* might be connected with the Kumarbi texts.[8] A revision of the relationship between Philo and Hesiod was now possible, and was attempted several years later by Guterbock. Guterbock argued that Philo was correct: Hesiod had drawn his material from the East, and from the Phoenicians in particular. Guterbock proposed that Philo's Phoenician story of Kronos preserved the source which was the intermediary through which the Kumarbi material reached Hesiod.[9]

The newly discovered sources from Ugarit and Boghazköi were thus responsible for a drastic shift in the evaluation of Philo's claims. While some doubters remained, few questioned the basic accuracy of at least some of Philo's claims.[10] The antiquity of Philo's sources became a majority, not a minority opinion; the whole thrust of scholarly endeavor became to discover material which would further support Philo's claims. In other words, one began by accepting the basic reliability of the material in Philo, and postulated that explanations of Philo in Phoenician terms were preferable.[11] Knowledge was advanced by illuminating as many passages as possible through the application of these principles.[12] Put crudely, the goal of these scholars was to prove as much of Philo as ancient and Phoenician as possible.

The dominant figure in this approach to Philo was Otto Eissfeldt. Beginning with the articles collected in 1939 in his *Ras Schamra und Sanchuniathon*, Eissfeldt repeatedly returned to the study of the Philonic fragments. While there was some development in Eissfeldt's evaluation of Philo's claims,[13] his final position was that Sanchuniathon actually lived in Beirut in the second half of the second millennium B.C. His work survived to be adapted and brought somewhat "up to date," by

---

[8] Forrer, "Götterkönigtum," pp. 710-713.

[9] Guterbock, *Kumarbi*, pp. 110-115.

[10] Among the doubters were Nautin, "Valeur Documentaire," pp. 577-578; K & R, pp. 31-32, n. 1.

[11] Eissfeldt, *S. von B.*, p. 27.

[12] Clapham, pp. 5-6.

[13] See e.g. Eissfeldt, *RS*, pp. 67-71.

Philo.[14] Eissfeldt probably inspired Walcot to adopt an even more extreme position.[15] In discussing the Greek myths of Typhon, Walcot is puzzled by the fact that certain aspects of the story in Apollodorus "are best understood if we refer not to Greek but to Hittite mythology. (But) the period of time which separates Apollodorus from the Hittite myths ... is immense, comprising as it does a thousand and more years."[16] Walcot proposes to explain this difficulty by assuming that "Apollodorus took advantage of the work of Hellenistic scholars who studied and translated texts current at the time when great empires controlled the Near East."[17] As proof that such ancient materials were still available and were being translated Walcot cites Manetho and Berossus and then turns to consider possible survivals of the Gilgamesh epic in Greek and Latin literature.[18] The final, "more positive clue," is the "vital piece of information about the material available to Philo of Byblos."[19] After a brief discussion of the problems of dating materials in Philo, Walcot writes that "It is surely reasonable to conclude that Philo did actually translate from Phoenician into Greek a text like those we know from Ugarit, and that his name should, therefore, be added to those of Berossus and his colleagues.[20]

Still more extreme was the position of Oldenburg. Oldenburg was convinced that "the revolutionizing Ugaritic discoveries have now definitely settled doubts about the old Canaanite origin of Sanchuniathon's *Phoenician History*."[21] In evaluating Philo's claims Oldenburg concluded that "the writer, after careful study of the *Phoenician History* and the criticisms written against it, finds no reason whatsoever to doubt the statements of Eusebius, Porphyry, and Philo concerning

---

[14] Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, p. 70. Both Clapham and Du Mesnil du Buisson would agree with this position. See Clapham, pp. 10ff. and e.g. Du Mesnil de Buisson, "El," p. 287.

[15] That Walcot was inspired by Eissfeldt is suggested by his citation of Eissfeldt, *S. von B.*, pp. 58ff. in developing his argument in *Hesiod*, p. 18.

[16] Walcot, *Hesiod*, p. 15.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 16-17.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 18. See also Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Etudes*, pp. 37-38.

[21] Oldenburg, *Conflict*, p. 4.

Sanchuniathon and his work."[22] Indeed, by the time Oldenburg completed his analysis of Philo, the material in the fragments represented a stratum of Phoenician mythology *even older* than that represented by the Ugaritic texts. Philo preserved myths and attitudes which began to change ca. 2000 B.C. Thus, although "the *Phoenician History* ... can hardly be older than the Ugaritic myths," it nonetheless preserves this pre-Ugaritic mythology.[23]

Nor was Oldenburg's a lonely idiosyncratic voice. While he did not convince some,[24] others agreed with him. Typical was this comment on Philo by Miller:

> Since the discovery and publication of the Ugaritic texts as well as some Hurrian mythological texts, Philo's *History* has been vindicated and shown to be far more reliable than ever suspected, having been based on quite ancient and authentic sources. Although some of his data may be late or secondary, still other parts of his or Sanchuniathon's reconstruction may represent an even earlier stage in the history of Canaanite mythology than that represented in the Ugaritic texts.[25]

Thus ended the second stage, during which progress in understanding Philo was made. The explosion of knowledge about the ancient Near East enabled scholars to understand Philo's Phoenician heritage. The drive to explain Philo in Near Eastern terms, however, had become extreme. The zeal and enthusiasm of scholars had carried them further than the evidence would support; the pendulum, having swung so far in one direction, was now ready to return. Beginning with Williams' thesis in 1968,[26] continuing in Barr's sober article in 1974,[27] and culminating in Troiani's book,[28] scholars began to remember that Philo of Byblos lived during the first and second centuries A.D. and that the concerns and beliefs of Philo's age might have significantly shaped the *Phoenician History*. Interpretations of Philo which relied on texts and doctrines current when Philo wrote were offered to replace interpretations based on texts from the second millennium B.C.

---

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 7. For example of how seriously Oldenburg takes this conclusion see below Chapter Five, p. 76, n. 41.

[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 142-145.

[24] Most notably Mulder, "Oldenburg," pp. 364-365 and Loewenstamm, "Philon," pp. 321-322.

[25] Miller, "El," p. 414.

[26] Williams, p. 199.

[27] Barr, "Philo of Byblos," pp. 20-21.

[28] Troiani, p. 38. Add now Oden, "Philo of Byblos," pp. 118-125.

In this third and most recent stage, Near Eastern explanations of Philo are not rejected. Rather, whatever has just been dug out of the ground is not uncritically accepted as the new "key" to the mysteries in Philo.[29] Near Eastern explanations are balanced against ones based on the reality of the Greco-Roman world in which Philo lived.

My sympathies, as should be clear, lie with Barr and Troiani. This book is intended to fill the gap whose existence was deplored by Barr when he noted that "no published article or monograph directly and entirely devoted to him [i.e. Philo] appears to have emerged from Anglo-Saxon scholarship over a period of two decades."[30] My intentions, however, are not limited to the world of Anglo-Saxon scholarship. Both Troiani and Barr have recognized the insurmountable difficulty in writing on Philo of Byblos: the need for mastery of Near Eastern and classical studies.[31] A writer on Philo ought to be able to talk to classicists and semitists on their own terms and convince both groups of the validity of his conclusions. Judged by these standards, Williams' thesis is far off the mark. Williams wrote as a classicist and knew little about the Near East. Troiani was far more successful, but he too was primarily concerned with studying Philo in the context of Greek historiography.[32] I therefore believe that much remains to be done, and hope to come closer than Troiani to accomplishing the impossible. I propose to begin afresh with a thorough analysis of the text in the hope that it will yield sufficient clues for a critical re-evaluation of the main problems.

ii

There is no need to collect or edit afresh the fragments of the *Phoenician History*. Jacoby, in Vol. 3C^2 of his *Fragmente der Grie-*

---

[29] Eissfeldt, *S. von B.*, p. 27, n. 2, recognized the crucial nature of this factor in studies on Philo. For an excellent example of the misunderstandings produced see Halevy's analysis of Philo's cosmogony based on the Enuma Elish, the new discovery of Halevy's day: Halevy, "Pothos et Mot." See also below, Chapter Six, p. 110, n. 62.

[30] Barr, "Philo of Byblos," p. 21.

[31] Troiani, pp. 11-12.

[32] Troiani, Prefazione. See also Parente, "Troiani," p. 217. Oden, "Philo of Byblos," pp. 118-125 analyzes Philo in the context of Hellenistic historiography.

chischen Historiker has collected and edited the fragments.[33] One caution applies in using Jacoby—for those fragments which come from Eusebius' *Preparation for the Gospel*, Jacoby's critical apparatus must be compared with that in Mras' edition of Eusebius.[34] Jacoby utilized Mras, but only reprints part of the critical apparatus.

Since almost all the fragments of Philo's *History* come from the first book of Eusebius' *Preparation for the Gospel* a brief summary of the manuscript tradition of the latter work seems appropriate.[35] The oldest and best manuscript is Parisiensis 451 (A). Written in 914 A.D., it contains books 1-5 of Eusebius' *Preparation.* Marcianus 343 (H) was copied from A in the eleventh century. It is particularly useful for restoring lacunae in A, and when A has been changed by a more recent hand. These two manuscripts form the basis of Mras' edition of books 1-5, hence of Jacoby's edition of Philo's fragments.

There are seventeen other codices, of which three have special importance. Parisiensis 465 (B) was written in the middle of the thirteenth century and represents a different branch of the manuscript tradition than A and H. Marcianus 341 (I) was written in the fifteenth century. It was copied, as a whole, from B, but apparently has some corrections based on A. Bononiensis 3643 (O) was written by two scribes, the older of whom worked in the early thirteenth century. It belongs to the same family as B and I. The other fourteen manuscripts are either copies of B, I, or O, or copies of copies.

Jacoby's text will be the basis for discussion of Philo in this book. All references to the fragments will be by page and line number in Jacoby. The commentary and argument may be clearest if the reader has a copy of Jacoby in hand. For the sake of those for whom this is impossible, and in order to make the commentary complete, Jacoby's text is also reprinted as Chapter Two.

---

[33] Earlier editions of the fragments were those of Orelli, Bunsen, and Muller, *FHG*, Vol. 3. pp. 560ff. Williams, in apparent ignorance of Jacoby, edited the fragments afresh but only utilized those in Eusebius and was apparently unaware of the few scraps of information available in other authors. Williams, pp. 53-68.

[34] Mras. *Praeparatio Evangelica.*

[35] For a fuller discussion see the introduction to Mras, *Praeparatio Evangelica.*

CHAPTER TWO

THE GREEK TEXT

Excerpt from: Felix Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* (*F Gr Hist*). Dritter Teil: Geschichte von Städten und Völkern (Horographie und Ethnographie). C, Autoren über einzelne Länder, Nr. 608a-856 (Zweiter Band: Illyrien-Thrakien Nr. 709-856), Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1969^2.

790. HERENNIUS PHILON VON BYBLOS

c. 54-142^p

T

1 (III 560) SUDA s.v. Φίλων Βύβλιος· γραμματικός. οὗτος γέγονεν ἐπὶ τῶν χρόνων τῶν ἐγγὺς Νέρωνος (54/68^p), καὶ παρέτεινεν εἰς μακρόν· ὕπατον γοῦν Σεβῆρον τὸν Ἐρέννιον χρηματίσαντα (c. 130^p?) αὐτὸς εἶναί φησιν (F 54), ὅταν ἦγεν η̄ καὶ ο̄ ἔτος, ὀλυμπιάδι δὲ † κ̄ καὶ διακοσιοστῆι (101/4^p). γέγραπται δὲ αὐτῶι Περὶ κτήσεως καὶ ἐκλογῆς βιβλίων βιβλία ι̅β̅· Περὶ πόλεων καὶ οὓς ἑκάστη αὐτῶν ἐνδόξους ἤνεγκε βιβλία λ̄· Περὶ τῆς βασιλείας Ἀδριανοῦ (ἐφ' οὗ καὶ ἦν ὁ Φίλων)· καὶ ἄλλα.

2 **a**) SUDA s.v. Ἕρμιππος Βηρύτιος· ἀπὸ κώμης μεσογαίου· μαθητὴς Φίλωνος τοῦ Βυβλίου, ὑφ' οὗ ᾠκειώθη Ἐρεννίωι Σευήρωι ἐπὶ Ἀδριανοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως, ἔκδουλος ὢν γένος, λόγιος σφόδρα. καὶ ἔγραψε πολλά (IV). ἔγραψε καὶ Περὶ ὀνείρων. **b**) – s.v. Παῦλος Τύριος· ῥήτωρ, γεγονὼς κατὰ Φίλωνα τὸν Βύβλιον· ὃς ἐπὶ Ἀδριανοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως πρεσβεύσας μητρόπολιν τὴν Τύρον ἐποίησεν. **c**) – s.v. Ἡρωδιανὸς Ἀλεξανδρεύς· γραμματικός, υἱὸς Ἀπολλωνίου . . . τοῦ ἐπικληθέντος Δυσκόλου. γέγονε κατὰ τὸν Καί-

---

15 βίβλιος AVFM^{ac} 15-21 οὗτος – ἄλλα om. F 16 τῶν om. AGM μακρόν (cf. s.v. Ἑρμογένης): Μάρκον Westermann 17-18 [αὐτὸς] – ὅταν <αὐτός> Mue 19 βιβλίων om. V 23 τοῦ βυβλίου om. (in lac.) A Ἐρεννίωι Kuester ἐρρενίωι o 24 ἔγραψε – ὀνείρων A^{mg}

σαρα Ἀντωνῖνον τὸν καὶ Μάρκον (161-180), ὡς νεώτερον εἶναι καὶ Διονυσίου τοῦ τὴν Μουσικὴν ἱστορίαν γράψαντος (IV) καὶ Φίλωνος τοῦ Βυβλίου.

3 Porphyr. *De abst.* 2, 56 (F 3a): ἡ Φοινικικὴ ἱστορία . . . ἣν Σαγχουνιάθων μὲν τῆι Φοινίκων γλώττηι συνέγραψεν, Φίλων δὲ ὁ Βύβλιος εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν δι' ὀκτὼ βιβλίων ἡρμήνευσεν. F 1 c. 9, 20/1.

4 Suda s.v. Σερῆνος· ὁ καὶ Ἀθηναῖος, ὁ Αἴλιος χρηματίσας· γραμματικός (s. II^p?). Ἐπιτομὴν τῆς Φίλωνος πραγματείας Περὶ πόλεων καὶ τίνες ἐφ' ἑκάστης ἔνδοξοι, βιβλία γ̄. F 17-18.

F

1. ΦΟΙΝΙΚΙΚΗ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ Α̅ – Η̅(Θ)

(F 9-11? 30/2? 37/8? 41/2? 45? 55?).

Α̅

1 (1) Euseb. *P.E.* 1, 9, 19: (14-18: die ältesten menschen kannten keine tempel, kultbilder, götter – ausser den gestirnen –, heroen, opfer usf.) ἡ γοῦν τῶν ἐθνῶν ἁπάντων πολύθεος πλάνη μακροῖς ὕστερον αἰῶσι πέφανται, ἀρξαμένη μὲν ἀπὸ Φοινίκων καὶ Αἰγυπτίων, διαβᾶσα δὲ ἐκ τούτων ἐπί τε τὰ λοιπὰ ἔθνη καὶ μέχρις αὐτῶν Ἑλλήνων, ὡς καὶ τοῦτο πάλιν ἡ τῶν παλαιτάτων ἱστορία κατέχει, ἣν καὶ αὐτὴν ἐπισκέψασθαι καιρὸς ἀπὸ τῶν Φοινικικῶν ἀρξαμένους.

(20) ἱστορεῖ δὲ ταῦτα Σαγχουνιάθων, ἀνὴρ παλαίτατος καὶ τῶν Τρωικῶν χρόνων, ὥς φασι, πρεσβύτερος, ὃν καὶ ἐπ' ἀκριβείαι καὶ ἀληθείαι τῆς Φοινικικῆς ἱστορίας ἀποδεχθῆναι μαρτυροῦσιν. Φίλων δὲ τούτου πᾶσαν τὴν συγγραφὴν – ὁ Βύβλιος, οὐχ ὁ Ἑβραῖος – μεταβαλὼν ἀπὸ τῆς Φοινίκων γλώττης ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνὴν ἐξέδωκε. (21) μέμνηται τούτων ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς τὴν καθ' ἡμῶν πεποιημένος συσκευὴν ἐν τετάρτωι τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὑποθέσεως (Porphyrios 260 F 34), ὧδε τῶι ἀνδρὶ μαρτυρῶν πρὸς λέξιν· «ἱστορεῖ δὲ τὰ περὶ Ἰουδαίων ἀληθέστατα, ὅτι καὶ τοῖς τόποις καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν αὐτῶν τὰ συμφωνότατα, Σαγχουνιάθων ὁ Βηρύτιος, εἰληφὼς τὰ ὑπομνήματα παρὰ

---

2 Βυβλίου Kuester βιβλίου AG(cp.) βίβλια V ἑβραίου B om. I 5 ὀκτώ: ἐννέα F 1 c. 9, 23 6 ὁ αἴλιος ὁ καὶ ἀθηναῖος Eudok ὁ καὶ Αἴλιος χρηματίσας, Ἀθηναῖος Bernhardy 7 ἀφ' Bernhardy 8 ἑκάστης πόλεως V 15-16 ἀρξαμένη – Αἰγυπτίων: cf. § 29; *P.E.* 1, 6, 1 16 δὲ A τε BO 17 τοῦτο A τούτων BO 18 φοινικικῶν B^{1}O φοινίκων A 19-26: F 2 § 42 19 δέ: δὴ A παλαιότατος A 20 πρεσβύτατος A 21 φοινικικῆς O φοινικῆς A^{1}B ἀποδειχθῆσα B^1 ἀποδειχθείση B^2 22 συγγραφὴν BO γραφὴν A 23 γλώττης A γλώσσης BO 24-p. 804, 12: Th(eodoret). *Graec. aff. cur.* 2, 44 f. 24-p. 804, 10 (βασιλίδος): Euseb. *P.E.* 10, 9, 11-16 (= Eus^2); stand bei Ph. nicht hier (s. zu F 9-11)? 24-26 (λέξιν): γράφει τοίνυν ἐν τῶι τετάρτωι τῆς καθ' ἡμῶν συσκευῆς ὁ Πορφύριος ῥήμασιν αὐτοῖς τάδε Eus^2 26 δέ: δὴ Eus^2 (I) 28 σαγχωνιάθων Eus^2 (O) Th (stets)

Ἱερομβάλου τοῦ ἱερέως θεοῦ Ἰευώ(?), ὃς Ἀβιβάλωι τῶι βασιλεῖ Βηρυτίων τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀναθεὶς ὑπ' ἐκείνου καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὸν ἐξεταστῶν τῆς ἀληθείας παρεδέχθη. οἱ δὲ τούτων χρόνοι καὶ πρὸ τῶν Τρωικῶν πίπτουσι χρόνων, καὶ σχεδὸν τοῖς Μωσέως πλησιάζουσιν, ὡς αἱ τῶν Φοινίκης βασιλέων μηνύουσι διαδοχαί. Σαγχουνιάθων δὲ ὁ κατὰ τὴν Φοινίκων διάλεκτον φιλαλήθως πᾶσαν τὴν παλαιὰν ἱστορίαν ἐκ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν ὑπομνημάτων καὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀναγραφῶν συναγαγὼν δὴ καὶ συγγράψας ἐπὶ Σεμιράμεως γέγονεν τῆς Ἀσσυρίων βασιλίδος, ἣ πρὸ τῶν Ἰλιακῶν ἢ κατ' αὐτούς γε τοὺς χρόνους γενέσθαι ἀναγέγραπται. τὰ δὲ τοῦ Σαγχουνιάθωνος εἰς Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν ἡρμήνευσεν Φίλων ὁ Βύβλιος. (22) ταῦτα μὲν ὁ δηλωθείς, ἀλήθειαν ὁμοῦ καὶ παλαιότητα τῶι δὴ θεολόγωι μαρτυρήσας· ὁ δὲ προιὼν οὐ τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸν οὐδὲ μὴν θεοὺς τοὺς κατ' οὐρανόν, θνητοὺς δὲ ἄνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας, οὐδὲ τὸν τρόπον ἀστείους, οἵους δι' ἀρετὴν ἄξιον εἶναι ἀποδέξασθαι ἢ ζηλῶσαι τῆς φιλοσοφίας, φαυλότητος δὲ καὶ μοχθηρίας ἁπάσης κακίαν περιβεβλημένους θεολογεῖ· καὶ μαρτυρεῖ γε τούτους αὐτοὺς ἐκείνους εἶναι τοὺς εἰσέτι καὶ νῦν θεοὺς παρὰ τοῖς πᾶσιν νενομισμένους κατά τε τὰς πόλεις καὶ τὰς χώρας. δέχου δὲ καὶ τούτων ἐκ τῶν ἐγγράφων τὰς ἀποδείξεις.

(23) ὁ δὴ Φίλων εἰς ἐννέα βίβλους τὴν πᾶσαν τοῦ Σαγχουνιάθωνος πραγματείαν διελὼν κατὰ τὸ προοίμιον τοῦ πρώτου συγγράμματος αὐτοῖς ῥήμασι προλέγει περὶ τοῦ Σαγχουνιάθωνος ταῦτα· (24) «τούτων οὕτως ἐχόντων ὁ Σαγχουνιάθων, ἀνὴρ πολυμαθὴς καὶ πολυπράγμων γενόμενος καὶ τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ἀφ' οὗ τὰ πάντα συνέστη, παρὰ πάντων εἰδέναι ποθῶν, πολυφροντιστικῶς ἐξεμάστευσεν τὰ Τααύτου, εἰδὼς ὅτι τῶν ὑφ' ἥλιον γεγονότων πρῶτός ἐστι Τάαυτος ὁ τῶν γραμμάτων τὴν εὕρεσιν ἐπινοήσας καὶ τῆς τῶν ὑπομνημάτων γραφῆς κατάρξας καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦδε ὥσπερ κρηπῖδα βαλόμενος τοῦ λόγου, ὃν Αἰγύπτιοι μὲν ἐκάλεσαν Θωύθ, Ἀλεξανδρεῖς δὲ Θώθ, Ἑρμῆν δὲ Ἕλληνες μετέ-

---

1 ἱερομβαλίου B θεοῦ A θεοῦ τοῦ BO τοῦ θεοῦ Th ἰευώ BO Eus^2 ἰευ (so) A ἰαώ Th ἀβιβάλωι (cf. 783 F 1 § 117) A ἀβελβάλωι BO(Th) Ἀβεδβάλωι Nöldeke 3 ὑπεδέχθη O^{ac} ἀπεδέχθη? 6 δὲ ὁ Eus^2 Th δὲ Eus^1 7 τὴν ἱστ. τὴν παλαιὰν O 8 ἐν om. BO ἀναγραφῶν AEus^2 -γράφων B γραφῶν Th 9 δὴ A^3 δὲ A^{ac} om. B Eus^2 12 βίβλιος A 13 ὁ δὲ: Porphyrios? 14 τοὺς (καὶ B) κατ' οὐρανόν: cf. § 14 γυναῖκας – τρόπον om. B 16 γε AB καὶ O 17 εἶναι om. A θεοὺς BO οἵους A 18 ἐγγράφων A γραφῶν BO 19 ἐννέα: ὀκτὼ T 3; F 3a 22-p. 805, 16: cf. F 10 § 43 22 ἀνὴρ δὲ A ἀνὴρ δὴ Mras 24 περὶ πάντων N^{c}DV εἰδὼς B πολυφροντιστικῶς v πολυφροντίστως Ddf 25-p. 805, 1 εἰδὼς – μετέφρασαν: F 2 § 14 25 τὰ τααύτου BO ταῦτα αὐτοῦ A cf. F 2 § 14 ὅτι BO τις A ἥλιον BO ἡλίωι A 26 ἐστι τάαυτος BO ἐστιν οὗτος A 28 βαλόμενος AB^2 βαλλ – B^{1}O 29 δὲ δεθωθ A

φρασαν>>. (25) ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἐπιμέμφεται τοῖς νεωτέροις τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα ὡς ἂν βεβιασμένως καὶ οὐκ ἀληθῶς τοὺς περὶ θεῶν μύθους ἐπ' ἀλληγορίας καὶ φυσικὰς διηγήσεις τε καὶ θεωρίας ἀνάγουσι. λέγει δ'οὖν προιών· (26) <<ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν νεώτεροι τῶν ἱερολόγων τὰ μὲν γεγονότα πράγματα ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀπεπέμψαντο, ἀλληγορίας δὲ καὶ μύθους ἐπινοήσαντες καὶ τοῖς κοσμικοῖς παθήμασι συγγένειαν πλασάμενοι μυστήρια κατέστησαν, καὶ πολὺν αὐτοῖς ἐπῆγον τῦφον, ὡς μὴ ῥαιδίως τινὰ συνορᾶν τὰ κατ' ἀλήθειαν γενόμενα· ὁ δὲ συμβαλὼν τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδύτων εὑρεθεῖσιν ἀποκρύφοις Ἀμμουνέων γράμμασι συγκειμένοις ἃ δὴ οὐκ ἦν πᾶσι γνώριμα, τὴν μάθησιν ἁπάντων αὐτὸς ἤσκησε, καὶ τέλος ἐπιθεὶς τῆι πραγματείαι τὸν κατ' ἀρχὰς μῦθον καὶ τὰς ἀλληγορίας ἐκποδὼν ποιησάμενος, ἐξηνύσατο τὴν πρόθεσιν, ἕως πάλιν οἱ ἐπιγενόμενοι ἱερεῖς χρόνοις ὕστερον ἠθέλησαν αὐτὴν ἀποκρύψαι καὶ εἰς τὸ μυθῶδες ἀποκαταστῆσαι, ἐξ οὗ τὸ μυστικὸν ἀνέκυπτεν οὐδέπω φθάσαν εἰς Ἕλληνας. (27) τούτοις ἑξῆς φησίν· <<ταῦθ' ἡμῖν εὕρηται ἐπιμελῶς εἰδέναι τὰ Φοινίκων ποθοῦσι καὶ πολλὴν ἐξερευνησαμένοις ὕλην, οὐχὶ τὴν παρ' Ἕλλησι· διάφωνος γὰρ αὕτη καὶ φιλονεικότερον ὑπ' ἐνίων μᾶλλον ἢ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν συντεθεῖσα>>. (28) καὶ μεθ' ἕτερα· <<οὕτως τε ἔχειν πεπεῖσθαι ἡμῖν παρέστη, ὡς ἐκεῖνος γέγραφε, τὴν διαφωνίαν ὁρῶσι τὴν παρ' Ἕλλησι, περὶ ἧς μοι τρία πεφιλοτίμηται βιβλία τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν ἔχοντα Παραδόξου ἱστορίας (F 12/3)>>. (29) καὶ αὖθις μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιλέγει· <<προδιαρθρῶσαι δὲ ἀναγκαῖον πρὸς τὴν αὖθις σαφήνειαν καὶ τὴν τῶν κατὰ μέρος διάγνωσιν, ὅτι οἱ παλαίτατοι τῶν βαρβάρων, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ Φοίνικές τε καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι, παρ' ὧν καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ παρέλαβον ἄνθρωποι, θεοὺς ἐνόμιζον μεγίστους τοὺς τὰ πρὸς τὴν βιωτικὴν χρείαν εὑρόντας ἢ καὶ κατά τι εὖ ποιήσαντας τὰ

1-16: cf. F 2 § 39-41 1 τοῖς – ταῦτα BO τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα νεωτέροις A [τοῖς νεώτεροις] (doch s. lin. 13/6)? 2 καὶ (vor φυσικὰς) om. BO 4 νεώτεροι Jac -τατοι o 5 δὲ om. A 5-6 ἐπενοήσαντο BO 7 τῦφον A τὸν τῦφον BO 8 τινὰς A γινόμενα O ὁ δὲ: *i.e.* Sanchuniathon 8-25 συμβαλὼν – βαρβάρων om. B 9 ἀμμουνέων O -οῦνσων A -ναίων Mras 13 ἐπιγινόμενοι A 17 πολλὰ O 17-18 ἐξερευνησαμένους A 18 ὕλην, <πλὴν (o. ἀλλ')> οὐχὶ? 21 ἣν διαφωνίαν A 22 περὶ ἧς A παρ' οἷς O 24-p. 806, 5: cf. Theodoret. *Graec. aff. cur.* 3, 25: καὶ τὸν Κρόνον ἄνθρωπον εἶναι Σαγχωνιάθων ἔφησε καὶ γυναῖκα τὴν Ῥέαν τὴν ἐκείνου ὁμόζυγα, καὶ τὸν Δία καὶ τὴν Ἥραν ἐκείνων γε παῖδας, εἶτα εὐεργεσιῶν τινων ἄρξαντας καὶ δεξαμένους τοῦ βίου τὸ τέλος, θείας παρὰ Φοινίκων ἀξιωθῆναι τιμῆς, καὶ θεοὺς ἀναγορευθῆναι, καὶ βωμοῖς καὶ θυσίαις καὶ ἐτησίοις τιμηθῆναι δημοθοινίαις. 24 αὖθις O αὐτὴν A 25 παλαίτατοι A -ότατοι O 27 μεγίστους BO καὶ μέγιστον A τοὺς τὰ A τοὺς τί BO ἔθνη· εὐεργέτας τε τούτους καὶ πολλῶν αἰτίους ἀγαθῶν ἡγούμενοι ὡς θεοὺς προσεκύνουν, καὶ εἰς τὸ χρεὼν μεταστάντας ναοὺς κατασκευασάμενοι στήλας τε καὶ ῥάβδους ἀφιέρουν ἐξ ὀνόματος αὐτῶν, καὶ ταῦτα μεγάλως σεβόμενοι καὶ ἑορτὰς ἔνεμον αὐτοῖς τὰς μεγίστας Φοίνικες, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν σφετέρων βασιλέων τοῖς κοσμικοῖς στοιχείοις καί τισι τῶν νομιζομένων θεῶν τὰς ὀνομασίας ἐπέθεσαν· φυσικοὺς δὲ ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς πλανήτας ἀστέρας καὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα καὶ τὰ τούτοις συναφῆ θεοὺς μόνους ἐγίνωσκον, ὥστ' αὐτοῖς τοὺς μὲν θνητοὺς τοὺς δὲ ἀθανάτους θεοὺς εἶναι>>.

2 (2) EUSEB. *P.E.* 1, 9, 30-10, 42: ταῦτα (F 1) κατὰ τὸ προοίμιον ὁ Φίλων διαστειλάμενος ἑξῆς ἀπάρχεται τῆς τοῦ Σαγχουνιάθωνος ἑρμηνείας, ὧδέ πως τὴν Φοινικικὴν ἐκτιθέμενος θεολογίαν·

(10) τὴν τῶν ὅλων ἀρχὴν ὑποτίθεται ἀέρα ζοφώδη καὶ πνευματώδη ἢ πνοὴν ἀέρος ζοφώδους καὶ χάος θολερὸν ἐρεβῶδες· ταῦτα δὲ εἶναι ἄπειρα καὶ διὰ πολὺν αἰῶνα μὴ ἔχειν πέρας. <<ὅτε δέ>> φησίν <<ἠράσθη τὸ πνεῦμα τῶν ἰδίων ἀρχῶν, καὶ ἐγένετο σύγκρασις, ἡ πλοκὴ ἐκείνη ἐκλήθη Πόθος· αὕτη δὲ ἀρχὴ κτίσεως ἁπάντων· αὐτὸ δὲ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκε τὴν αὐτοῦ κτίσιν. καὶ ἐκ τῆς αὐτοῦ συμπλοκῆς τοῦ πνεύματος ἐγένετο Μώτ. τοῦτό τινές φασιν ἰλύν, οἱ δὲ ὑδατώδους μίξεως σῆψιν. καὶ ἐκ ταύτης ἐγένετο πᾶσα σπορὰ κτίσεως καὶ γένεσις τῶν ὅλων. (2) ἦν δέ τινα ζῶια οὐκ ἔχοντα αἴσθησιν, ἐξ ὧν ἐγένετο ζῶια νοερά· καὶ ἐκλήθη Ζοφασημίν, τοῦτ' ἔστιν οὐρανοῦ κατόπται. καὶ ἀνεπλάσθη ὁμοίως ὠιοῦ σχήματι. καὶ ἐξέλαμψε Μώτ, ἥλιός τε καὶ σελήνη ἀστέρες τε καὶ ἄστρα μεγάλα>>.

(3) τοιαύτη μὲν αὐτῶν ἡ κοσμογονία, ἄντικρυς ἀθεότητα εἰσάγουσα· ἴδωμεν δὲ ἑξῆς, ὡς καὶ τὴν ζωιογονίαν ὑποστῆναι λέγει. φησὶν οὖν· (4) <<καὶ τοῦ ἀέρος διαυγάσαντος, διὰ πύρωσιν καὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τῆς γῆς ἐγένετο πνεύματα καὶ νέφη καὶ οὐρανίων ὑδάτων μέγισται καταφοραὶ καὶ χύσεις. καὶ ἐπειδὴ διεκρίθη καὶ τοῦ ἰδίου τόπου

---

2 μεταστάντας Wyttenbach καταστάντας ABO 3 κατασκευασάμενοι A μετασκ- BO 4 ταύτας BO 7 ἐπέθεσαν O προέθεσαν (-θέασαν A^1) A^c ἐτίθεσαν B προσέθηκαν Mras 7-10: *P.E.* 1, 9, 5 ἔχεις δὲ καὶ ἐν τῆι Φοινικικῆι θεολογίαι, ὡς ἄρα Φοινίκων οἱ πρῶτοι φυσικοὶ ἥλιον – θεοὺς μόνους (A μόνον BO) ἐγίνωσκον (weiter zu p. 807, 11-14) 7 δὲ om. A 13 φοινικὴν A^1 15 ὑποτίθεται (*scil.* Σαγχουνιάθων) AB ὑποτίθενται O 16 ζοφώδη O 17 ὅτε AB ὅτι O 21 Μώτ om. A φασιν om. A ὑδατώδη O 24 ζωφασημιν (so) A Ζωφησαμίν Clemen 24-25 ἐξ οὐρανοῦ O 26 σελήνη: μήνη B 27 αὐτῶι A κοσμογένεια A^1 30 ὑδάτων om. BO

διεχωρίσθη διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἡλίου πύρωσιν, καὶ πάλιν συνήντησε πάντα ἐν ἀέρι τάδε τοῖσδε, καὶ συνέρραξαν, βρονταί τε ἀπετελέσθησαν καὶ ἀστραπαί, καὶ πρὸς τὸν πάταγον τῶν βροντῶν τὰ προγεγραμμένα νοερὰ ζῶια ἐγρηγόρησεν, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἦχον ἐπτύρη, καὶ ἐκινήθη ἔν τε γῆι καὶ θαλάσσηι ἄρρεν καὶ θῆλυ».

(5) τοιαύτη αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡ ζωιογονία. τούτοις ἑξῆς ὁ αὐτὸς συγγραφεὺς ἐπιφέρει λέγων· «ταῦθ' ηὑρέθη ἐν τῆι κοσμογονίαι γεγραμμένα Τααύτου καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνου ὑπομνήμασιν ἔκ τε στοχασμῶν καὶ τεκμηρίων, ὧν ἑώρακεν αὐτοῦ ἡ διάνοια καὶ ηὗρε καὶ ἡμῖν ἐφώτισεν».

(6) ἑξῆς τούτοις ὀνόματα τῶν ἀνέμων εἰπὼν Νότου καὶ Βορέου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐπιλέγει· «ἀλλ' οὗτοί γε πρῶτοι ἀφιέρωσαν τὰ τῆς γῆς βλαστήματα, καὶ θεοὺς ἐνόμισαν, καὶ προσεκύνουν ταῦτα, ἀφ' ὧν αὐτοί τε διεγένοντο καὶ οἱ ἑπόμενοι καὶ οἱ πρὸ αὐτῶν πάντες, καὶ χοὰς καὶ ἐπιθύσεις ἐποίουν». <ἔλεον δὲ καὶ οἶκτρν καὶ κλαυθμὸν βλαστήματι γῆς ἀπιόντι καθιέρουν, καὶ γενέσει ζώιων ἐκ γῆς πρώτηι καὶ τῆι ἐξ ἀλλήλων καὶ τελευτῆι, καθ' ἣν τοῦ ζῆν ἀπήρχοντο>.» καὶ ἐπιλέγει· «αὗται δ'ἦσαν αἱ ἐπίνοιαι τῆς προσκυνήσεως ὅμοιαι τῆι αὐτῶν ἀσθενείαι καὶ ψυχῆς <ἔτι> ἀτολμίαι». (7) εἶτά φησι γεγενῆσθαι ἐκ τοῦ Κολπία ἀνέμου καὶ γυναικὸς Βάαυ (τοῦτο δὲ νύκτα ἑρμηνεύει) Αἰῶνα καὶ Πρωτόγονον θνητοὺς ἄνδρας οὕτω καλουμένους· εὑρεῖν δὲ τὸν Αἰῶνα τὴν ἀπὸ δένδρων τροφήν. ἐκ τούτων τοὺς γενομένους κληθῆναι Γένος καὶ Γενεάν, καὶ οἰκῆσαι τὴν Φοινίκην· αὐχμῶν δὲ γενομένων, τὰς χεῖρας ὀρέγειν εἰς οὐρανὸν πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον· «τοῦτον γάρ (φησίν) θεὸν ἐνόμιζον μόνον οὐρανοῦ κύριον Βεελσάμην καλοῦντες, ὅ ἐστι παρὰ Φοίνιξι κύριος οὐρανοῦ, Ζεὺς δὲ παρ' Ἕλλησιν». (8) μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα πλάνην Ἕλλησιν αἰτιᾶται λέγων· «οὐ γὰρ ματαίως αὐτὰ πολλαχῶς διεστειλάμεθα, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς αὖθις παρεκδοχὰς τῶν ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν ὀνομάτων, ἅπερ οἱ Ἕλληνες

---

1 ἐχωρίσθη A 1-2 πάντα σ. πάλιν O 2 ἀέρι BO ἀκαρῆ A ἀκαρεῖ H^c 4 νοερὰ om. BO ἐγρηγόρησαν O 5 ἐπτύρη καὶ om. B 6 συγγραφεύς: *i.e.* Σαγχουνιάθων 7 τααύτου BO τὰ αὐτοῦ A 8 ἐκείνου BO αὐτοῦ A 10 βορέα A 11-17 οὗτοι: *scil.* οἱ παλαίτατοι; cf. *P.E.* 1, 9, 5 (s. zu p. 806, 7-10 = Eus^2) καὶ ὅτι τούτοις οἱ παλαίτατοι τὰ (om. A) τῆς γῆς ἀφιέρωσαν βλαστήματα – ἀπήρχοντο. αὗται – ἀτολμίαι. ταῦτα καὶ ἡ Φοινίκων γραφή, ὡς ἑξῆς ἀποδειχθήσεται 13 αὐτοὶ καὶ Eus^2 (A) διεγίνοντο A Eus^2 14 ἐπιθύσεις Eus^2 (A) ἐποίουν: ἐτέλουν (ἐπε- O) Eus^2 14-17 ἔλεον – ἀπήρχοντο om. Eus^1 15 βλαστήματι BO καὶ βλαστήματα A 18 <ἔτι> Eus^2 20 βάαυ (Βάαυτ Bochart) τοῦτο BO βᾶ αὐτοῦ τι A θνητοὺς BO ητοὺς A 21 ἀπὸ τῶν BO 22 γενομένους A γεννωμένους BO (richtig?) κληθῆναι: καὶ A 23 ὀρέγειν εἰς οὐρανὸν B ὀρ. πρὸς οὐ. O εἰς οὐρανοὺς ὀρ. A 24 βεελσάμην A -μῆν BO; cf. Plaut. *Poen.* 1027 26 δὲ om. BO 27 αὖθις BO εὐθεῖς A

ἀγνοήσαντες ἄλλως ἐξεδέξαντο, πλανηθέντες τῆι ἀμφιβολίαι τῆς μεταφράσεως>>. (9) ἑξῆς φησιν ἀπὸ Γένους Αἰῶνος καὶ Πρωτογόνου γεννηθῆναι αὖθις παῖδας θνητούς, οἷς εἶναι ὀνόματα Φῶς καὶ Πῦρ καὶ Φλόξ· οὗτοι (φησίν) ἐκ παρατριβῆς ξύλων εὗρον πῦρ, καὶ τὴν χρῆσιν ἐδίδαξαν. υἱοὺς δὲ ἐγέννησαν οὗτοι μεγέθει τε καὶ ὑπεροχῆι κρείσσονας, ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα τοῖς ὄρεσιν ἐπετέθη ὧν ἐκράτησαν, ὡς ἐξ αὐτῶν κληθῆναι τὸ Κάσσιον καὶ τὸν Λίβανον καὶ τὸν Ἀντιλίβανον καὶ τὸ Βραθύ. ἐκ τούτων (φησίν) ἐγεννήθη<σαν> Σαμημρούμος, ὁ καὶ Ὑψουράνιος, <καὶ Οὔσωος>· ἀπὸ μητέρων δὲ (φησίν) ἐχρημάτιζον, τῶν τότε γυναικῶν ἀνέδην μισγομένων οἷς ἂν ἐντύχοιεν. (10) εἶτά φησι τὸν Ὑψουράνιον οἰκῆσαι Τύρον, καλύβας τε ἐπινοῆσαι ἀπὸ καλάμων καὶ θρύων καὶ παπύρου· στασιάσαι δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν Οὔσωον, ὃς σκέπην τῶι σώματι πρῶτος ἐκ δερμάτων ὧν ἴσχυσε συλλαβεῖν θηρίων εὗρε. ῥαγδαίων δὲ γενομένων ὄμβρων καὶ πνευμάτων, παρατριβέντα τὰ ἐν τῆι Τύρωι δένδρα πῦρ ἀνάψαι, καὶ τὴν αὐτῶν ὕλην καταφλέξαι· δένδρου δὲ λαβόμενον τὸν Οὔσωον καὶ ἀποκλαδεύσαντα πρῶτον τολμῆσαι εἰς θάλασσαν ἐμβῆναι· ἀνιερῶσαι δὲ δύο στήλας Πυρὶ καὶ Πνεύματι, καὶ προσκυνῆσαι αἷμά τε σπένδειν αὐταῖς ἐξ ὧν ἤγρευε θηρίων. τούτων δὲ τελευτησάντων, τοὺς ἀπολειφθέντας φησὶ ῥάβδους αὐτοῖς ἀφιερῶσαι, καὶ τὰς στήλας προσκυνεῖν, καὶ τούτοις ἑορτὰς ἄγειν κατ' ἔτος. (11) χρόνοις δὲ ὕστερον πολλοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς Ὑψουρανίου γενεᾶς γενέσθαι Ἀγρέα καὶ Ἁλιέα τοὺς ἁλιείας καὶ ἄγρας εὑρετάς, ἐξ ὧν κληθῆναι ἀγρευτὰς καὶ ἁλιεῖς. ἐξ ὧν γενέσθαι δύο ἀδελφοὺς σιδήρου εὑρετὰς καὶ τῆς τούτου ἐργασίας, ὧν θάτερον τὸν Χουσὼρ λόγους ἀσκῆσαι καὶ ἐπωιδὰς καὶ μαντείας. εἶναι δὲ τοῦτον τὸν Ἥφαιστον, εὑρεῖν δὲ καὶ ἄγκιστρον καὶ δέλεαρ καὶ ὁρμιὰν καὶ σχεδίαν, πρῶτόν τε πάντων ἀνθρώπων πλεῦσαι. διὸ καὶ ὡς θεὸν αὐτὸν μετὰ θάνατον ἐσεβάσθησαν. καλεῖσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ Δία Μειλίχιον· οἱ δὲ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ τοίχους φασὶν ἐπινοῆσαι ἐκ πλίνθων. (12) μετὰ ταῦτα ἐκ τοῦ γένους τούτων γενέσθαι νεανίας δύο, καλεῖσθαι δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν μὲν Τεχνίτην. τὸν δὲ Γήινον Αὐτόχθονα· οὗτοι ἐπενόησαν τῶι πηλῶι τῆς πλίνθου συμμιγνύειν

---

1 ἐξελέξαντο A 2 γένους Clemen, Mras 4 εὗρον ἐκ π. ξ. πῦρ A 6 κάσσιον BO κάσβιον A 7 καὶ τὸν Ἀντιλίβανον om. A 7-9 Ἀντιλίβανον – γυναικῶν om. B 7-8 ἐγεννήθησαν μημρουμος (so!) A ἐγεννήθη σαμημροῦμος O ἐγεννήθη Σαμηροῦμος Bochart 8 ὁ καὶ AO <καὶ Οὔσωος> Ddf 9 ἐχρημάτιζον τῶν B(?) O ἐχρηματίζοντο A ἀνέδην v ἀναίδην ABO ἂν om. A 10 τὸν – Τύρον om. B 11 θρίων B(?) παπύρου A -ρων BO οὔσωον AO οὔσων B 12 τῶι σώματι om. A πρῶτος A πρῶτον B om. O 14 αὐτῶν A αὐτόθι BO λαβομένου A Οὔσωον: οὔσωνα B^c 15 θάλατταν A 15-16 τε δύο A 20 ἁλιείας καὶ ἄγρας AB^c ἀγρείας καὶ ἄγρας O 21 ἐξ οὗ O 22 χουσὼρ BO(?) χρυσὼρ A: cf. 784 F 4 ἀσκήσεως A 23 εἶναι – ὀνομάζεται p. 809, 4 om. B εὑρεῖν δὲ (om. καὶ) ἄ. A 24 τε A δὲ O 25 δία μειλίχιον O διαμίχιον A 25-26 τὸν ἀδελφὸν Clemen 26 αὐτοῦ O αὐτῶν A 27 νεανίας O γενεὰς AH 28 συμμιγνύειν O -νυσιν A

φορυτόν, καὶ τῶι ἡλίωι αὐτὰς τερσαίνειν· ἀλλὰ καὶ στέγας ἐξεῦρον. ἀπὸ τούτων ἐγένοντο ἕτεροι, ὧν ὁ μὲν Ἀγρὸς ἐκαλεῖτο, ὁ δὲ Ἀγροῦ ἥρως ἢ Ἀγρότης, οὗ καὶ ξόανον εἶναι μάλα σεβάσμιον καὶ ναὸν ζυγοφορούμενον ἐν Φοινίκηι· παρὰ δὲ Βυβλίοις ἐξαιρέτως θεῶν ὁ μέγιστος ὀνομάζεται. (13) ἐπενόησαν δὲ οὗτοι αὐλὰς προστιθέναι τοῖς οἴκοις καὶ περιβόλους καὶ σπήλαια. ἐκ τούτων ἀγρόται καὶ κυνηγοί. οὗτοι δὲ καὶ Ἀλῆται καὶ Τιτᾶνες καλοῦνται. ἀπὸ τούτων γενέσθαι Ἄμυνον καὶ Μάγον, οἳ κατέδειξαν κώμας καὶ ποίμνας. ἀπὸ τούτων γενέσθαι Μισὼρ καὶ Συδύκ, τουτέστιν εὔλυτον καὶ δίκαιον. οὗτοι τὴν τοῦ ἁλὸς χρῆσιν εὗρον. (14) ἀπὸ Μισὼρ Τάαυτος, ὃς εὗρε τὴν τῶν πρώτων στοιχείων γραφήν, ὃν Αἰγύπτιοι μὲν Θωύθ, Ἀλεξανδρεῖς δὲ Θώθ, Ἕλληνες δὲ Ἑρμῆν ἐκάλεσαν. ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Συδὺκ Διόσκουροι ἢ Κάβειροι ἢ Κορύβαντες ἢ Σαμοθρᾶικες· οὗτοι (φησί) πρῶτοι πλοῖον εὗρον. ἐκ τούτων γεγόνασιν ἕτεροι, οἳ καὶ βοτάνας εὗρον καὶ τὴν τῶν δακετῶν ἴασιν καὶ ἐπωιδάς.

(15) κατὰ τούτους γίνεταί τις Ἑλιοῦν καλούμενος Ὕψιστος καὶ θήλεια λεγομένη Βηρούθ, οἳ καὶ κατώικουν περὶ Βύβλον. ἐξ ὧν γεννᾶται Ἐπίγειος Αὐτόχθων, ὃν ὕστερον ἐκάλεσαν Οὐρανόν, ὡς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς στοιχεῖον δι' ὑπερβολὴν τοῦ κάλλους ὀνομάζειν οὐρανόν. γεννᾶται δὲ τούτωι ἀδελφὴ ἐκ τῶν προειρημένων, ἣ καὶ ἐκλήθη Γῆ· καὶ διὰ τὸ κάλλος ἀπ' αὐτῆς (φησίν) ἐκάλεσαν τὴν ὁμώνυμον γῆν. ὁ δὲ τούτων πατὴρ ὁ Ὕψιστος ἐν συμβολῆι θηρίων(?) τελευτήσας ἀφιερώθη, ὧι χοὰς καὶ θυσίας οἱ παῖδες ἐτέλεσαν. (16) παραλαβὼν δὲ ὁ Οὐρανὸς τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀρχὴν ἄγεται πρὸς γάμον τὴν ἀδελφὴν Γῆν, καὶ ποιεῖται ἐξ αὐτῆς παῖδας τέσσαρας· Ἦλον τὸν καὶ Κρόνον καὶ Βαίτυλον καὶ Δαγὼν (ὅς ἐστι Σίτων) καὶ Ἄτλαντα. καὶ ἐξ ἄλλων δὲ γαμετῶν ὁ Οὐρανὸς πολλὴν ἔσχε γενεάν· διὸ χαλεπαίνουσα ἡ Γῆ τὸν Οὐρανὸν ζηλοτυποῦσα ἐκάκιζεν, ὡς καὶ διαστῆναι ἀλλήλων. (17) ὁ δὲ Οὐρανὸς ἀποχωρήσας αὐτῆς, μετὰ βίας ὅτε καὶ ἐβούλετο ἐπιὼν καὶ πλησιάζων αὐτῆι,

---

2 ἀγροῦ ἥρως AO ἀγρούηρως NV (v vor Mras) ἀγρότης O ἀβρότης A 4 βιβλίοις A 5 περιβόλους AO -λα.α B 7 ποίμνας A ποίμνια B (O fehlt) 8 μισὼρ A μείσωρα B (O unleserlich) συδύκ A συδὲκ G (O unleserlich) σεδὲκ B; cf. § 25; 38 9 μισὼρ A μείσωρ B G (O zerstört) 9-11 Τάαυτος – ἐκάλεσαν: F 1 § 24 9 οὐ τάαυτος BO οὗτος αὐτὸς A ὁ Τάαυτος Mras οὖν T.? s. zu p. 804, 25 10 θωύθ A θωὼρ BO ἀλ. δὲ θώθ BO om. A 11 τοῦ om. A συδὺκ A συδὲκ BO κάβιροι A κορύβαντες A κύρβαντες BO (richtig?) 13 δακετῶν AB δεκάτων O 14 ἐλιοῦν A ἐλιούμ (ἐλ- V) O (N) ἐνούμ B 15 βηρούθ BO ῥουθ A βίβλον A βέβλον B^1 15-16 ἐπίγειος αὐτόχθων (cf. § 12) A ἐπ. ἢ αὐ. BO 16-17: ὃν ὕστερον <δι' ὑπερβολὴν τοῦ κάλλους> ἐκ. Οὐρανόν, ὡς – στοιχεῖον [δι' ὑ.τ.κ.] ὀνομάζειν οὐρανόν? τοῦ περὶ ἡμᾶς στοιχείου A^1 18 ἀπ' αὐτῆς BO αὐτῆς A 19-20 ἐν συμβολῆι A ἐν (ἐκ B^2) συμβολῆς B ἐν συμβολαῖς O 20 θηρίων BO αιψριων (so) A οἱ om. B (O unleserlich) 21 ἄγε' B^2 22 ἦλον A ἶλον BO 23 βαίτυλον O βέτυλον B β . . τυλον (rasur) A 23-24 γαμετῶν BO γενετῶν A 25 ἐκάκιζεν BO κακίζειν A κακίζει Mras 26 ἐπιὼν A^cO ἐστιῶν B^1 ἐστιῶν B^2

πάλιν ἀπηλλάττετο· ἐπιχειρεῖν δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐξ αὐτῆς παῖδας διαφθείρειν, τὴν δὲ Γῆν ἀμύνασθαι πολλάκις, συμμαχίαν αὐτῆι συλλεξαμένην. εἰς ἄνδρας δὲ προελθὼν ὁ Κρόνος, Ἑρμῆι τῶι τρισμεγίστωι συμβούλωι καὶ βοηθῶι χρώμενος – οὗτος γὰρ ἦν αὐτῶι γραμματεύς – τὸν πατέρα Οὐρανὸν ἀμύνεται τιμωρῶν τῆι μητρί. (18) Κρόνωι δὲ γίνονται παῖδες Περσεφόνη καὶ Ἀθηνᾶ. ἡ μὲν οὖν πρώτη παρθένος ἐτελεύτα, τῆς δὲ Ἀθηνᾶς γνώμηι καὶ Ἑρμοῦ κατεσκεύασε Κρόνος ἐκ σιδήρου ἅρπην καὶ δόρυ. εἶτα ὁ Ἑρμῆς τοῖς τοῦ Κρόνου συμμάχοις λόγους μαγείας διαλεχθεὶς πόθον ἐνεποίησε τῆς κατὰ τοῦ Οὐρανοῦ μάχης ὑπὲρ τῆς Γῆς· καὶ οὕτως Κρόνος τὸν Οὐρανὸν πολέμωι συμβαλὼν τῆς ἀρχῆς ἤλασε, καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν διεδέξατο. ἑάλω δὲ ἐν τῆι μάχηι καὶ ἡ ἐπέραστος τοῦ Οὐρανοῦ σύγκοιτος ἐγκύμων οὖσα, ἣν ἐκδίδωσιν ὁ Κρόνος Δαγῶνι πρὸς γάμον· τίκτει δὲ παρὰ τούτωι ὃ κατὰ γαστρὸς ἐξ Οὐρανοῦ ἔφερεν, ὃ καὶ ἐκάλεσε Δημαροῦν. (19) ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ Κρόνος τεῖχος περιβάλλει τῆι ἑαυτοῦ οἰκήσει, καὶ πόλιν πρώτην κτίζει τὴν ἐπὶ Φοινίκης Βύβλον. (20) μετὰ ταῦτα τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον Ἄτλαντα ὑπονοήσας ὁ Κρόνος μετὰ γνώμης τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ εἰς βάθος γῆς ἐμβαλὼν κατέχωσε. κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν Διοσκούρων σχεδίας καὶ πλοῖα συνθέντες ἔπλευσαν, καὶ ἐκριφέντες κατὰ τὸ Κάσσιον ὄρος ναὸν αὐτόθι ἀφιέρωσαν. οἱ δὲ σύμμαχοι Ἤλου τοῦ Κρόνου Ἐλωεὶμ ἐπεκλήθησαν, ὡς ἂν Κρόνιοι οὗτοι ἦσαν οἱ λεγόμενοι ἐπὶ Κρόνου. (21) Κρόνος δὲ υἱὸν ἔχων Σάδιδον ἰδίωι αὐτὸν σιδήρωι διεχρήσατο δι' ὑπονοίας αὐτὸν ἐσχηκώς, καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτόχειρ τοῦ παιδὸς γενόμενος ἐστέρησεν· ὡσαύτως καὶ θυγατρὸς ἰδίας τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀπέτεμεν, ὡς πάντας ἐκπεπλῆχθαι θεοὺς τὴν Κρόνου γνώμην. (22) χρόνου δὲ προιόντος Οὐρανὸς ἐν φυγῆι τυγχάνων θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ παρθένον Ἀστάρτην μεθ' ἑτέρων ἀδελφῶν αὐτῆς δύο Ῥέας καὶ Διώνης, δόλωι τὸν Κρόνον ἀνελεῖν ὑποπέμπει, ἃς καὶ ἑλὼν ὁ Κρόνος κουριδίας γαμετὰς ἀδελφὰς οὔσας ἐποιήσατο. (23) γνοὺς δὲ Οὐρανὸς ἐπιστρατεύει κατὰ τοῦ Κρόνου Εἱμαρμένην καὶ Ὥραν μεθ' ἑτέρων συμμάχων, καὶ ταύτας ἐξοικειωσάμενος ὁ Κρόνος παρ' ἑαυτῶι κατέσχεν. ἔτι δὲ (φησίν) ἐπενόησε θεὸς Οὐρανὸς βαιτύλια, λίθους ἐμψύχους μηχανησάμενος. (24) Κρόνωι δὲ ἐγένοντο ἀπὸ

---

1 ἀπηλλάσσετο A ἐπιχειρεῖν A ἐπεχείρει BO 2 αὐτῆι o 3 ἑρμεῖ A 4 αὐτῶι AO αὐτοῦ B ἀμύνεται om. A 6 οὖν om. O τελευτᾶι A Ἀθηνᾶς – Ἑρμοῦ BO μετὰ γνώμης καὶ μετὰ ἑρμοῦ A 8 πότον B τοῖς κατὰ B κατὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ A κατ' οὐρανὸν BO 9 ὑπὲρ γῆς A οὕτω(ς) B(O) οὗτος A πολεμῶν A 10 ἑάλω δὲ καὶ ἐν τ.μ. A 11-12 δαγῶνι πρὸς γάμον A πρὸς (εἰς O) γάμον τῶ δαγὼν BO 13 δημαροῦν BIO διμάρουν A; cf. § 27/8; 31 τῆι om. O 14 πόλιν πρώτην A πρ. π. BO φοινίκης A -κη BO βύβλον O βίβλον A βέβλον B 17 συνθέντες AB σύνθετα O κατὰ BO περὶ A 18-23 οἱ δὲ – γνώμην om. B 18 ἥλου A ἴλου O ἐλωεὶμ ἐπεκλήθησαν O ἐλωι μετεβλήθησαν A 19 ἦσαν v εἴησαν Schwartz 21 γινόμενος A 22 ἐκπεπλῆσθαι A χρόνου A χρόνου BO 24 ῥέα(ν) καὶ διώνη(ν) A^{c} (m. 1) 27-28 οἰκειωσάμενος B 28 ὁ om. A

Ἀστάρτης θυγατέρες ἑπτὰ Τιτανίδες ἢ Ἀρτέμιδες. καὶ πάλιν τῶι αὐτῶι γίνονται ἀπὸ Ῥέας παῖδες ἑπτά, ὧν ὁ νεώτατος ἅμα τῆι γενέσει ἀφιερώθη· καὶ ἀπὸ Διώνης θήλειαι * *, καὶ ἀπὸ Ἀστάρτης πάλιν ἄρρενες δύο, Πόθος καὶ Ἔρως. (25) ὁ δὲ Δαγὼν ἐπειδὴ εὗρε σῖτον καὶ ἄροτρον, ἐκλήθη Ζεὺς Ἀρότριος. Συδύκωι δὲ τῶι λεγομένωι δικαίωι μία τῶν Τιτανίδων συνελθοῦσα γεννᾶι τὸν Ἀσκληπιόν. (26) ἐγεννήθησαν δὲ καὶ ἐν Περαίαι Κρόνωι τρεῖς παῖδες, Κρόνος ὁμώνυμος τῶι πατρὶ καὶ Ζεὺς Βῆλος καὶ Ἀπόλλων. κατὰ τούτους γίνονται Πόντος καὶ Τυφὼν καὶ Νηρεὺς πατὴρ Πόντου, Βήλου δὲ παῖς. (27) ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Πόντου γίνεται Σιδών, ἣ καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εὐφωνίας πρώτη ὕμνον ὠιδῆς εὗρε, καὶ Ποσειδῶν. τῶι δὲ Δημαροῦντι γίνεται Μέλκαθρος ὁ καὶ Ἡρακλῆς. (28) εἶτα πάλιν Οὐρανὸς πολεμεῖ Πόντωι, καὶ ἀποστὰς Δημαροῦντι † προστίθεται ἔπεισί τε Πόντωι ὁ Δημαροῦς, τροποῦται δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Πόντος· ὁ δὲ Δημαροῦς φυγῆς θυσίαν ηὔξατο. (29) ἔτει δὲ τριακοστῶι δευτέρωι τῆς ἑαυτοῦ κρατήσεως καὶ βασιλείας ὁ Ἦλος (τοῦτ' ἔστιν ὁ Κρόνος) Οὐρανὸν τὸν πατέρα λοχήσας ἐν τόπωι τινὶ μεσογείωι καὶ λαβὼν ὑποχείριον ἐκτέμνει αὐτοῦ τὰ αἰδοῖα σύνεγγυς πηγῶν τε καὶ ποταμῶν, ἔνθα ἀφιερώθη Οὐρανός, καὶ ἀπηρτίσθη αὐτοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ ἀπέσταξεν αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα τῶν αἰδοίων εἰς τὰς πηγὰς καὶ τῶν ποταμῶν τὰ ὕδατα· καὶ μέχρι τούτου δείκνυται τὸ χωρίον.

(30) τοσαῦτα μὲν δὴ τὰ τοῦ Κρόνου, καὶ τοιαῦτά γε τὰ σεμνὰ τοῦ παρ' Ἕλλησι βοωμένου βίου τῶν ἐπὶ Κρόνου, οὓς καί φασι γεγονέναι πρῶτον χρύσεόν τε γένος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων, τῆς μακαριζομένης ἐκείνης τῶν παλαιῶν εὐδαιμονίας. πάλιν δὲ ὁ συγγραφεὺς τούτοις μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιφέρει λέγων·

(31) <<Ἀστάρτη δὲ ἡ μεγίστη καὶ Ζεὺς Δημαροῦς καὶ Ἄδωδος βασιλεὺς θεῶν ἐβασίλευον τῆς χώρας Κρόνου γνώμηι. ἡ δὲ Ἀστάρτη ἐπέθηκε τῆι ἰδίαι κεφαλῆι βασιλείας παράσημον

1-2 θυγατέρας – Ῥέας om. BO 3 * * (zahl und namen?) Jac 5 συδύκωι A συδὲκ O σεδὲκ B; cf. § 13 6 περαίαι A (Steph. Byz. s.v.?) τῆι περαίαι BO 7 Ζεὺς Βῆλος: *P.E.* 3, 10, 20 Φοινίκων μὲν οὖν οἱ πρῶτοι θεολόγοι, ὡς ἐν τῶι πρώτωι συγγράμματι παρεστήσαμεν, τὸν Δία παῖδα Κρόνου θνητὸν ἀπὸ θνητοῦ γενόμενον, ἄνδρα Φοίνικα τὸ γένος, ἀπεμνημόνευον 8 βήλου δὲ παῖς A om. BO 9 σιδών, ἣ BO σιδώνη A 10 διμαροῦντι (auch v. 11/2) A μέλκαθρος A μέλκαρθος BO 11-12 ἀποστὰς Δημαροῦς (αὐτῶι)? 12-13 ἔπεισί – Πόντος om. A 13 δὲ A τε BO διμαροῦς A 13 ηὔξαντο O ἔτει AB^2 ἔτι B^1O 14 Ἴλος BO 15 περιτέμνει λοχήσας A 15-16 μεσογείωι – αὐτοῦ om. A περιτέμνει λοχήσας ἐν τόπωι τινὶ τὰ αἰδοῖα AH 17 πνεῦμα A αἷμα BGDV (O unleserlich) 20-23 εὐδαιμονίας: zusammenfassung eher Eusebs als Ph.s (s. § 20) 20 τὰ τοῦ: τοῦ om. A 20-21 τὰ σεμνὰ – χρόνου A τὰ παρ' – χρόνου τὰ σεμνὰ O τὰ παρ' – τοῦ ἐπὶ Κρόνου τὰ σεμνὰ B 21 οὓς om. A 22 τῶν παλ. ἐκείνης B 23 δὲ A om. BO ὁ συγγραφεύς: Philon? τούτοις om. B ἐπιφέρει μεθ' ἕτ. B 24 καὶ ζεὺς δημαροῦς BO καὶ ζεύς· καὶ διμάρους A <ὁ> καὶ Ἄδωδος Gruppe

κεφαλὴν ταύρου· περινοστοῦσα δὲ τὴν οἰκουμένην εὗρεν ἀεροπετῆ
ἀστέρα, ὃν καὶ ἀνελομένη ἐν Τύρωι τῆι ἁγίαι νήσωι
ἀφιέρωσε. τὴν δὲ Ἀστάρτην Φοίνικες τὴν Ἀφροδίτην εἶναι
λέγουσι. (32) καὶ ὁ Κρόνος δὲ περιιὼν τὴν οἰκουμένην Ἀθηνᾶι
τῆι ἑαυτοῦ θυγατρὶ δίδωσι τῆς Ἀττικῆς τὴν βασιλείαν. (33)
λοιμοῦ δὲ γενομένου καὶ φθορᾶς, τὸν ἑαυτοῦ μονογενῆ υἱὸν
* * ὁ Κρόνος Οὐρανῶι τῶι πατρὶ ὁλοκαρποῖ, καὶ τὰ αἰδοῖα F 3; 10
περιτέμνεται, ταὐτὸν ποιῆσαι καὶ τοὺς ἅμ' αὐτῶι συμμάχους
ἐξαναγκάσας. (34) καὶ μετ' οὐ πολὺ ἕτερον αὐτοῦ παῖδα ἀπὸ
Ῥέας ὀνομαζόμενον Μοὺθ ἀποθανόντα ἀφιεροῖ· Θάνατον δὲ
τοῦτον καὶ Πλούτωνα Φοίνικες ὀνομάζουσι. (35) καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις
ὁ Κρόνος Βύβλον μὲν τὴν πόλιν θεᾶι Βααλτίδι τῆι καὶ
Διώνηι δίδωσι, Βηρυτὸν δὲ Ποσειδῶνι καὶ Καβείροις Ἀγρόταις
τε καὶ Ἁλιεῦσιν, οἳ καὶ τὰ τοῦ Πόντου λείψανα εἰς τὴν Βηρυτὸν
ἀφιέρωσαν. (36) πρὸ δὲ τούτων θεὸς Τάαυτος μιμησάμενος τῶν
συνόντων(?) θεῶν ὄψεις, Κρόνου τε καὶ Δαγῶνος καὶ τῶν
λοιπῶν, διετύπωσεν τοὺς ἱεροὺς τῶν στοιχείων χαρακτῆρας. F 4
ἐπενόησε δὲ καὶ τῶι Κρόνωι παράσημα βασιλείας ὄμματα
τέσσαρα ἐκ τῶν ἐμπροσθίων καὶ ὀπισθίων μερῶν, <δύο μὲν
ἐγρηγορότα>, δύο δὲ ἡσυχῇ μύοντα· καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων πτερὰ
τέσσαρα, δύο μὲν ὡς ἱπτάμενα, δύο δὲ ὡς ὑφειμένα. (37) τὸ δὲ
σύμβολον ἦν, ἐπειδὴ Κρόνος κοιμώμενος ἔβλεπε, καὶ ἐγρηγορῶς
ἐκοιμᾶτο· καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πτερῶν ὁμοίως, ὅτι ἀναπαυόμενος
ἵπτατο, καὶ ἱπτάμενος ἀνεπαύετο. τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς θεοῖς δύο
ἑκάστωι πτερώματα ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων, ὡς ὅτι δὴ συνίπταντο τῶι
Κρόνωι· καὶ αὐτῶι δὲ πάλιν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς πτερὰ δύο, ἓν ἐπὶ
τοῦ ἡγεμονικωτάτου νοῦ καὶ ἓν ἐπὶ τῆς αἰσθήσεως. (38) ἐλθὼν
δὲ ὁ Κρόνος εἰς νότου χώραν ἅπασαν τὴν Αἴγυπτον παρέδωκε
θεῶι Τααύτωι, ὅπως βασίλειον αὐτῶι γένηται. ταῦτα δὲ (φησί)

---

2 ἀστέρα om. B   3-17 τὴν δὲ – χαρακτῆρας om. B   7 * *: ἐξ ἐπιχωρίας νύμφης Ἀνωβρὲτ (F 3b)? 'ex legitima uxore' Mue   ὁλοκαυτοῖ Mue   8 ταυτὸν A ταυτὸ O   9 ἐξαναγκάσας A καταν- O   10 ἀφιεροῖ O ἱεροῖ A   12 βίβλον A   13 διώνηι (cf. § 22) A διώδη O   ποσειδῶνι A ποσειδὼν O   καβήροις A   15 τάαυτος O ταῦθ' ὃς A; cf. F 1 § 23; F 2 § 14; 38; F 4 § 53; F 10   15-16 τῶν συνόντων θ. ὄψεις O τὸν οὐρανὸν τῶν θεῶν ὄψει A τῶν οὐρανοέντων (ο. οὐρανιώνων) δ.? Mue τῶν τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐχόντων θ.ὄ.?   16 δαγῶνος A δαγὼν O   18 καὶ om. B   19-20 <δ. μ. ἐ.> Jac <δύο μὲν *> Gaisford <δ. μ. ἀτενὲς βλέποντα> Mras   20 μύοντα BO νεύοντα A   21 ἱπτάμενα A -μένου BO   ὡς om. A   23 ὅτι BO ἔτι A   24 ἵπταται B   δύο <ἦν>?   25 συνίπτανται B   28 παρέδωκεν A ἔδωκε BO   29 τααύτωι BO ταυθω (so) A

πρῶτοι πάντων ὑπεμνηματίσαντο οἱ ἑπτὰ Συδὲκ παῖδες Κάβειροι καὶ ὁ ὄγδοος αὐτῶν ἀδελφὸς Ἀσκληπιός, ὡς αὐτοῖς ἐνετείλατο θεὸς Τάαυτος.

(39) ταῦτα πάντα ὁ Θαβίων, ὃς πάμπρωτος τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος γεγονότων Φοινίκων ἱεροφάντης ἀλληγορήσας τοῖς τε φυσικοῖς καὶ κοσμικοῖς πάθεσιν ἀναμίξας, παρέδωκε τοῖς ὀργεῶσι καὶ τελετῶν κατάρχουσι προφήταις· οἱ δὲ τὸν τῦφον αὔξειν ἐκ παντὸς ἐπινοοῦντες τοῖς αὐτῶν διαδόχοις παρέδοσαν καὶ τοῖς ἐπεισάκτοις, ὧν ἦν καὶ Εἰσίριος <ὁ> τῶν τριῶν γραμμάτων εὑρετής, ἀδελφὸς Χνᾶ τοῦ πρώτου μετονομασθέντος Φοίνικος>>. (40) εἶθ' ἑξῆς αὖθις ἐπιλέγει· <<οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες εὐφυίαι πάντας ὑπερβαλλόμενοι τὰ μὲν πρῶτα πλεῖστα ἐξιδιώσαντο, εἶτα καὶ τοῖς προκοσμήμασι ποικίλως ἐξετραγώιδησαν, ταῖς τε τῶν μύθων ἡδοναῖς θέλγειν ἐπινοοῦντες παντοίως ἐποίκιλλον. ἔνθεν Ἡσίοδος οἵ τε κυκλικοὶ περιηχημένοι Θεογονίας καὶ Γιγαντομαχίας καὶ Τιτανομαχίας ἔπλασαν ἰδίας καὶ ἐκτομάς, οἷς συμπεριφερόμενοι ἐξενίκησαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. (41) σύντροφοι δὲ τοῖς ἐκείνων πλάσμασιν αἱ ἀκοαὶ ἡμῶν γενόμεναι καὶ προληφθεῖσαι πολλοῖς αἰῶσιν ὡς παρακαταθήκην φυλάσσουσιν ἥνπερ ἐδέξαντο μυθοποιίαν, καθάπερ καὶ ἀρχόμενος εἶπον, ἥτις συνεργηθεῖσα χρόνωι δυσεξίτητον αὐτῆς τὴν κατοχὴν ἀπείργασται, ὥστε τὴν μὲν ἀλήθειαν δοκεῖν λῆρον, τὸ δὲ τῆς ἀφηγήσεως νόθον ἀλήθειαν>>.

(42) ταῦτα ἀπὸ τῆς Σαγχουνιάθωνος προκείσθω γραφῆς, ἑρμηνευθείσης μὲν ὑπὸ Φίλωνος τοῦ Βυβλίου, δοκιμασθείσης δὲ ὡς ἀληθοῦς ὑπὸ τῆς Πορφυρίου τοῦ φιλοσόφου μαρτυρίας (F 1 § 21; es folgt F 10).

3 (3-4) **a)** Porphyr. *De abst.* 2, 56 (Euseb. *P.E.* 4, 16, 6): Φοίνικες δὲ ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις συμφοραῖς ἢ πολέμων ἢ αὐχμῶν ἢ λοιμῶν ἔθυον τῶν φιλτάτων τινά, ἐπιφημίζοντες Κρόνωι· καὶ πλήρης δὲ ἡ Φοινικικὴ ἱστορία F 2 § 33; F 10

---

1 ὑπεμνηματίσαντο A ἀπ- BO συδὲκ BO σύδου A Συδύκου Mras; cf. § 25 1-2 κάβηροι A 2 ὄγδοος BO ἴδιος A 3 τάαυτος BO ταυθός A 4-22: F 1 § 25/8 4 θαβίων, ὃς πάμπρωτος A θαυίωνος παῖς πρῶτος BO 6 ὀργεῶσι BO ὀργαιῶσι A 7-25 οἱ δὲ – μαρτυρίας om. B τοῖς αὐτῶν διαδόχοις (cf. F 1 § 26) v ταῖς αὐ. διαδοχαῖς AO (Mras) 9 ἦν A εἷς ἔτι O εἰσίριος A ἴσιρις O <ὁ> Jac γραμμάτων O -τέων A 10 πρώτου O om. A 11 ἐπιλέγει: *i.e.* Philon 12 εἶτα om. A καὶ om. O 13 τε om. O 17 δὲ om. O 19 ἥνπερ ἐδέξαντο A ἣν παρεδέξαντο O 20 εἶπον O εἶπεν A 21 δυσεξίτηλον? Mras ἀπείργασται A εἴργασται O 23-25: F 1 § 20 23 προσκείσθω O 24 βιβλίου A ἀληθοῦς Vigier -θῶς o 27 ἢ λ. ἢ αὐ. Eus ἔθυον Eus ἐθύοντο Porph 28 ἐπιφημίζοντες Lobeck ἐπιψηφίζοντες Porph Eus τῶι χρόνωι Eus (O) πλήρης δὲ Porph π. γε (τε BO) Eus

τῶν θυσάντων, ἣν Σαγχουνιάθων μὲν τῆι Φοινίκων γλώττηι συνέγραψεν, Φίλων δὲ ὁ Βύβλιος εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν δι' ὀκτὼ βιβλίων ἡρμήνευσεν. **b**) EUSEB. *P.E.* 4, 16, 11: ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἐκ τῆς προδηλωθείσης κείσθω γραφῆς (*scil.* τοῦ Πορφυρίου). ἐκ δὲ τοῦ πρώτου συγγράμματος τῆς Φίλωνος Φοινικικῆς ἱστορίας παραθήσομαι ταῦτα· «ἔθος ἦν τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἐν ταῖς μεγάλαις συμφοραῖς τῶν κινδύνων ἀντὶ τῆς πάντων φθορᾶς τὸ ἠγαπημένον τῶν τέκνων τοὺς κρατοῦντας ἢ πόλεως ἢ ἔθνους εἰς σφαγὴν ἐπιδιδόναι λύτρον τοῖς τιμωροῖς δαίμοσι· κατεσφάττοντο δὲ οἱ διδόμενοι μυστικῶς. Κρόνος τοίνυν, ὃν οἱ Φοίνικες Ἦλ προσαγορεύουσιν, βασιλεύων τῆς χώρας καὶ ὕστερον μετὰ τὴν τοῦ βίου τελευτὴν εἰς τὸν τοῦ Κρόνου ἀστέρα καθιερωθείς, ἐξ ἐπιχωρίας νύμφης Ἀνωβρὲτ λεγομένης υἱὸν ἔχων μονογενῆ, ὃν διὰ τοῦτο Ἰεοὺδ ἐκάλουν (τοῦ μονογενοῦς οὕτως ἔτι καὶ νῦν καλουμένου παρὰ τοῖς Φοίνιξι) κινδύνων ἐκ πολέμου μεγίστων κατειληφότων τὴν χώραν, βασιλικῶι κοσμήσας σχήματι τὸν υἱὸν βωμόν τε κατασκευασάμενος κατέθυσεν».

***4** (9) EUSEB. *P.E.* 1, 10, 45: (F 10) ὁ δ' αὐτὸς πάλιν περὶ τῶν Φοινίκων F 2 § 14?
στοιχείων ἐκ τῶν Σαγχουνιάθωνος μεταβάλλων θέα(?) ὁποῖά φησι περὶ τῶν ἑρπυστικῶν καὶ ἰοβόλων θηρίων, ἃ δὴ χρῆσιν μὲν ἀγαθὴν ἀνθρώποις οὐδεμίαν συντελεῖ, φθορὰν δὲ καὶ λύμην οἷς ἂν τὸν δυσαλθῆ καὶ χαλεπὸν ἰὸν ἐγχρίμψειεν ἀπεργάζεται. γράφει δὲ καὶ ταῦτα πρὸς λέξιν ὧδέ πως λέγων·

(46) «τὴν μὲν οὖν τοῦ δράκοντος φύσιν καὶ τῶν ὄφεων αὐτὸς ἐξεθείασεν ὁ Τάαυτος, καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν αὖθις Φοίνικές τε καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι· πνευματικώτατον γὰρ τὸ ζῶιον πάντων τῶν ἑρπετῶν καὶ πυρῶδες ὑπ' αὐτοῦ παρεδόθη· παρ' ὃ καὶ τάχος ἀνυπέρβλητον διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος παρίστησι, χωρὶς ποδῶν τε καὶ χειρῶν ἢ ἄλλου τινὸς τῶν ἔκτοσθεν, δι' ὧν τὰ λοιπὰ ζῶια τὰς κινήσεις

---

1 σαγχωνιάθων Eus (BO) γλώττηι Porph Eus (A) γλώσσηι Eus (BO) 2-3 Φίλων – ἡρμήνευσεν om. Eus (B) 2 βίβλιος Eus (A) 2-3 δι' ὀκτὼ βιβλίων Porph Eus (διὸ ἐκ τῶν A); cf. F 1 § 23 2 γλῶσσαν Porph Eus 3 οὖν om. O 5 φοινικῆς A 9 τιμωροῖς A πονηροῖς O κατέσφαττον τότε A 10 ἦλ O ιηλ (*i.e.* Ἰσραήλ) A (1, 10, 44 = F 10: ἦλ A ἰσραὴλ BGNV; O fehlt) 13 ἀνοβρὲτ O ἄνωβριν 1, 10, 44 (A) τὸν διὰ τοῦτον A ἰεοὺδ D, Eissfeldt ἰουεουτ A ἰεδοὺδ N (1, 10, 44: ἰδοῦδ A ἱροὺδ BO ἱεροὺδ N) 14 καὶ νῦν ἔτι O 15 κινδ. – μεγίστων: s. F 2 § 33 16 χώραν: πόλιν 1, 10, 44 (BO) 18-p. 816, 12: nach Gruppe *Griech. Kulte u. Mythen* I p. 367 ff. 'interpolation' aus einem 'allegorisierenden philosophen'; s. Komm. 18 αὐτὸς: d.i. Philon φοινικικοὺς O 19 μεταβάλλων A -αλὼν BO 21-22 ἐγχρίμψειεν A -ρίψ- BO 22 πως AB πη O 24 (p. 815, 6) τάαυτος BO ταυθὸς A 25 τῶν om. A 26 παρ' ὧι BO 28 ἔκτοσθεν Gaisford, Ddf ἔκτοθεν A ἔξωθεν BO δι' ὧν A ἐξ ὧν BO

ποιεῖται· καὶ ποικίλων σχημάτων τύπους ἀποτελεῖ, καὶ κατὰ τὴν πορείαν ἑλικοειδεῖς ἔχει τὰς ὁρμὰς ἐφ' ὃ βούλεται τάχος. (47) καὶ πολυχρονιώτατον δέ ἐστιν, οὐ μόνον τε ἐκδυόμενον τὸ γῆρας νεάζειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὔξησιν ἐπιδέχεσθαι μείζονα πέφυκε· καὶ ἐπειδὰν τὸ ὡρισμένον μέτρον πληρώσηι, εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀναλίσκεται, ὡς ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς ὁμοίως αὐτὸς ὁ Τάαυτος κατέταξε γραφαῖς. διὸ καὶ ἐν ἱεροῖς τοῦτο τὸ ζῶιον καὶ μυστηρίοις συμπαρείληπται. (48) εἴρηται δὲ ἡμῖν περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπιγραφομένοις 'Εθωθ(ι)ῶν(?) ὑπομνήμασιν (F 8) ἐπὶ πλεῖον, ἐν οἷς κατασκευάζεται, ὅτι ἀθάνατον εἴη, καὶ ὡς εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀναλύεται, ὥσπερ πρόκειται· οὐ γὰρ θνήσκει ἰδίωι θανάτωι εἰ μὴ βίαι τινὶ πληγὲν τοῦτο τὸ ζῶιον. Φοίνικες δὲ αὐτὸ 'Αγαθὸν δαίμονα καλοῦσιν. ὁμοίως καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι κνὴφ ἐπονομάζουσι· προστιθέασι δὲ αὐτῶι ἱέρακος κεφαλὴν διὰ τὸ πρακτικὸν τοῦ ἱέρακος. (49) καί φησιν 'Επήεις(?) ἀλληγορῶν – ὁ ὀνομασθεὶς παρ' αὐτοῖς μέγιστος ἱεροφάντης καὶ ἱερογραμματεύς, ὃν μετέφρασεν Ἄρειος 'Ηρακλεοπολίτης – κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως· 'τὸ πρῶτον ὂν θειότατον ὄφις ἐστίν, ἱέρακος ἔχων μορφήν, ἄγαν ἐπίχαρις, ὃς εἰ ἀναβλέψειε, φωτὸς τὸ πᾶν ἐπλήρου ἐν τῆι πρωτογόνωι χώραι αὐτοῦ· εἰ δὲ καμμύσειε, σκότος ἐγίνετο, ἔμφασιν διδοὺς ὁ 'Επήεις, ὅτι καὶ διάπυρόν ἐστι διὰ τοῦ φάναι διηύγασε'· φωτὸς γὰρ ἴδιόν ἐστι τὸ διαυγάσαι. (50) παρὰ Φοινίκων δὲ καὶ Φερεκύδης (Vorsokr.^{5} 7 [71] B 4) λαβὼν τὰς ἀφορμὰς ἐθεολόγησε περὶ τοῦ παρ' αὐτῶι λεγομένου 'Οφιονέως(?) θεοῦ καὶ τῶν 'Οφιονιδῶν, περὶ ὧν αὖθις λέξομεν. (51) ἔτι μὴν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐννοίας τὸν κόσμον γράφοντες περιφερῆ κύκλον ἀεροειδῆ καὶ πυρωπὸν χαράσσουσι καὶ μέσα τεταμένον ὄφιν ἱερακόμορφον (καὶ ἔστι τὸ πᾶν σχῆμα ὡς τὸ παρ' ἡμῖν Θῆτα), τὸν μὲν κύκλον κόσμον μηνύοντες, τὸν δὲ μέσον ὄφιν συνεκτικὸν τούτου 'Αγαθὸν δαίμονα σημαίνοντες. (52) καὶ Ζωροάστρης δὲ ὁ μάγος ἐν τῆι 'Ιερᾶι Συναγωγῆι τῶν Περσικῶν φησι κατὰ

---

3 τε BO τὸ A^{ac} τῶι A^{c} (m. 1?) 6-11 ὡς – ἀναλύεται om. B 7 ἐν μυστ. v (vor Mras) 8-9 ἐπιγραφομένοις O -γεγραμμένοις A γεγραμμένοις AH 9 ἐθωθων A ἐθωθῶν O ἐθωθιῶν NDV^{ac} Θωθείων ('Kommentar zu den schriften oder lehren des Thot') Gutschmid, Eissfeldt ἐθῶν θείων Scal 'Εθῶν 'Οθνείων Mras 10 ἀθάνατον A -τος O 13 κνὴτ I 15 (21) ἐπήεις BO ὀπήεις A ὁ om. A 16 παρ' αὐτοῖς: *scil.* τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις? 17 μετέφρασεν <εἰς 'Ελλάδα φωνὴν> Gaisford 18 τὸ πρῶτον om. B ὂν A ὃν BO 19 ἐπίχαρες O 21 ὁ ἐπήεις BO ὀπήεις A καὶ om. BO 24 'Οφιονέως Orig. *c. Cels.* 6, 42(?) ὀφιωνέως B^{1} O ὀφίονος A 25 ὀφιονιδῶν A -ωνίδων O -εωνίδων B 27 μέσα A μέσον BO

λέξιν· ʽὁ δὲ θεός ἐστι κεφαλὴν ἔχων ἱέρακος, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πρῶτος· ἄφθαρτος, ἀίδιος, ἀγένητος, ἀμερής, ἀνομοιότατος(?), ἡνίοχος παντὸς καλοῦ, ἀδωροδόκητος, ἀγαθῶν ἀγαθώτατος, φρονίμων φρονιμώτατος. ἔστι δὲ καὶ πατὴρ εὐνομίας καὶ δικαιοσύνης, αὐτοδίδακτος, φυσικὸς καὶ τέλειος καὶ σοφὸς καὶ ἱεροῦ φυσικοῦ μόνος εὑρετής᾽. τὰ δ᾽αὐτὰ καὶ ᾽Οστάνης φησὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῆι ἐπιγραφομένηι ᾽Οκτατεύχωι. (53) πάντες δὲ τὰς ἀφορμὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ Τααύτου λαβόντες ἐφυσιολόγησαν, ὥσπερ πρόκειται. καὶ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα στοιχεῖα τὰ διὰ τῶν ὄφεων ναοὺς κατασκευασάμενοι ἐν ἀδύτοις ἀφιέρωσαν, καὶ τούτοις ἑορτὰς καὶ θυσίας ἐπετέλουν καὶ ὄργια, θεοὺς τοὺς μεγίστους νομίζοντες καὶ ἀρχηγοὺς τῶν ὅλων. τοσαῦτα καὶ περὶ τῶν ὄφεων».

(54) ἀλλὰ γὰρ τὰ μὲν τῆς Φοινίκων θεολογίας τοῦτον περιέχει τὸν τρόπον, ἣν ἀμεταστρεπτὶ φεύγειν . . . . ὁ σωτήριος εὐαγγελίζεται λόγος. (55) ὅτι δὲ μὴ μῦθοι ταῦτα καὶ ποιητῶν ἀναπλάσματα λανθάνουσάν τινα ἐν ὑπονοίαις ἔχοντα θεωρίαν τυγχάνει, σοφῶν δὲ καὶ παλαιῶν (ὡς ἂν αὐτοὶ φαῖεν) θεολόγων ἀληθεῖς μαρτυρίαι τὰ καὶ ποιητῶν ἁπάντων καὶ λογογράφων πρεσβύτερα περιέχουσαι, τό τε πιστὸν τῶν λόγων ἐπαγόμεναι ἀπὸ τῆς εἰσέτι δεῦρο ἐν ταῖς κατὰ Φοινίκην πόλεσί τε καὶ κώμαις κρατούσης τῶν θεῶν προσηγορίας τε καὶ ἱστορίας τῶν τε παρ᾽ ἑκάστοις ἐπιτελουμένων μυστηρίων, δῆλον ἂν εἴη ὡς μηκέτι χρῆναι τούτων βιαίους ἀνιχνεύειν φυσιολογίας, σαφῆ τὸν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἔλεγχον ἐπιφερομένων τῶν πραγμάτων. τοιαύτη μὲν οὖν ἡ Φοινίκων θεολογία.

B̄

5 (7) Lydus *De mens.* 4, 154 p. 170, 3 Wü: (οἱ δὲ Φοίνι)κες κατὰ τ(ὸν τῆ)ς ὁμωνυμίας (τρόπον εἴτε κατ)ά τινα ἀ(λληγορ)ίαν ἄλλως πως περὶ Κρόνου ἔχου(σιν, ὡς ἐκ τῆ)ς δευτέρας τῶν Φοινικικῶν τοῦ ῾Ερεννίου Φίλωνος (ἔστι λαβεῖ)ν. καὶ βασιλεῦσαι δὲ αὐτὸν ἡ ἱστορία πα(ρα)δίδωσιν, (ὡς ἔμπρο)σθεν ἀφηγησάμην, κ(ατά) τε τὴν Λιβύην (καὶ) Σικελίαν (καὶ τοὺς ἑσπερίους τό)πους, καὶ π(ό)λιν κτίσαι, ὡς ὁ Χάραξ (103 F 32) φησίν, τ(ὴν τότε μὲν λεγ)ομένην

---

2 ἀγεννητος BO 4-5 δικαιοσύνη A 6-10 καὶ ὀστάνης – ἀφιέρωσαν om. B 7 ὀκτατεύχωι A -τέχνω O 8 ἀπὸ τοῦ τααύτου O παρὰ ταυθοῦ A 10 ἀδύτοις A αὐτοῖς GNV (O zerstört) 11 τούς τε B 13-22: Euseb. *P.E.* 2 pr. 1-2 (= Eus²) 14 ἣν ἀμεταστρεπτὶ BO ἧς -τεὶ A 15 τινα BO τὴν A 19 θεῶν BO θείων A 20-22: δῆλον ἂν εἴη ἀπό τε τῆς τῶν λοιπῶν συγγραφέων καὶ δὴ καὶ τῶν νομιζομένων θεολόγων ὁμολογίας, δι᾽ ἧς ἐμαρτύρησαν τοὺς παλαιοὺς καὶ πρώτους τὰ περὶ θεῶν συστησαμένους μηδὲν εἰς φυσικὰς ἀναφέρειν τροπολογίας μηδ᾽ ἀλληγορεῖν τοὺς περὶ θεῶν μύθους, ἐπὶ μόνης δὲ τῆς λέξεως φυλάττειν τὰς ἱστορίας Eus² 22 οὖν om. A 24-p. 817, 3: ( ) edd 28-29 (καὶ – τό)πους Wünsch (οἰκίσαι τε τοὺς τό)πους Hase 29 κτίσαι v κτῆσαι O

Κρονίαν, νῦν δὲ Ἱερὰν πόλιν, ὡς Ἰσίγονος (περὶ Παλ?)ικῶν θεῶν (IV) καὶ Πολέμων (IV) καὶ Αἰσχύλος ἐν τῆι Αἴτνηι (F 11 N^2) π(αραδιδόασιν, καὶ ὡς πᾶσ)α ἡ ἱστορία κατὰ τὸν Εὐήμερον (63 T 4) ποικίλλ(εται) . . . .

OHNE BUCHZAHL (BUCHTITEL)

6 (8) Steph. Byz. s.v. Νίσιβις· πόλις ἐν τῆι περαίαι τῆι πρὸς τῶι Τίγρητι ποταμῶι. Φίλων ἐν Φοινικικοῖς Νάσιβις φησὶ διὰ τοῦ ᾱ· Οὐράνιος (675 F 30) δὲ διὰ τοῦ ε̄ Νέσιβις. σημαίνει δέ, ὥς φησι Φίλων, νάσιβις τὰς στήλας· ὁ δὲ Οὐράνιος <<νέσιβις>> φησί, <<σημαίνει τῆι Φοινίκων φωνῆι λίθοι συγκείμενοι, συμφορητοί>>.

7 (–) Lydus *De mens.* 4, 53 p. 109, 13 Wü: ὅτι πολλὴ τοῖς θεολόγοις διαφωνὴ περὶ τοῦ παρ' Ἑβραίων τιμωμένου θεοῦ καὶ γέγονε καὶ ἔστιν . . . . . . ὁ μέντοι Πορφύριος ἐν τῶι Ὑπομνήματι τῶν λογίων τὸν δὶς ἐπέκεινα (τουτέστιν τὸν τῶν ὅλων δημιουργόν) τὸν παρὰ Ἰουδαίων τιμώμενον εἶναι ἀξιοῖ, ὃν ὁ Χαλδαῖος δεύτερον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἅπαξ ἐπέκεινα (τουτέστιν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ) θεολογεῖ. οἱ μέντοι περὶ Ἰάμβλιχον καὶ Συριανὸν καὶ Πρόκλον δημιουργὸν αὐτὸν τοῦ αἰσθητοῦ κόσμου νομίζουσιν εἶναι, καλοῦντες αὐτὸν τῆς τετραστοίχου θεόν. ὁ δὲ Ῥωμαῖος Βάρρων περὶ αὐτοῦ διαλαβών φησ' παρὰ Χαλδαίοις ἐν τοῖς μυστικοῖς αὐτὸν λέγεσθαι Ἰάω ἀντὶ τοῦ φῶς νοητὸν τῆι Φοινίκων γλώσσηι, ὥς φησιν Ἑρέννιος. καὶ Σαβαὼθ δὲ πολλαχοῦ λέγεται, οἷον ὁ ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἑπτὰ πόλους (τουτέστιν ὁ δημιουργός). πολλαὶ μὲν οὖν οὕτω περὶ αὐτοῦ δόξαι, κρείττους δὲ μᾶλλον οἱ ἄγνωστον αὐτὸν καὶ ἄδηλον θεολογοῦντες. ὅτι δὲ σφάλλονται οἱ Διόνυσον αὐτὸν εἶναι νομίζοντες . . . . ἐξ αὐτῶν ἄν τις τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς νομίμων λάβοι . . . .

[2. ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΦΟΙΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΩΝ]

(F 4)

3. ΕΘΩΘ(Ι)ΩΝ (?) ΥΠΟΜΝΗΜΑΤΑ

8 (9) Euseb. *P.E.* 1, 10, 48: s. F 4 p. 815, 8 ff.

4. ΠΕΡΙ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ

(cf. F 1 § 21; F 7)

9 (6) Origenes *c. Cels.* 1, 15 p. 67, 21 Koetschau: πόσωι δὲ βελτίων Κέλσου . . . ὁ Πυθαγόρειος Νουμήνιος, ὅστις ἐν τῶι πρώτωι Περὶ τἀγαθοῦ λέγων περὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν ὅσα περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς ἀσωμάτου διείληφεν, ἐγκατέταξεν αὐτοῖς καὶ Ἰουδαίους . . . . . λέγεται δὲ καὶ Ἕρμιππον (IV) ἐν τῶι πρώτωι Περὶ γομοθετῶν ἱστορηκέναι Πυθαγόραν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φιλοσοφίαν ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων εἰς Ἕλληνας ἀγαγεῖν. καὶ Ἑκαταίου δὲ

---

1 (περὶ Παλ)ικῶν M. Mayer (περὶ Ἑλλην)ικῶν Hase 2 καὶ ὡς Wünsch ἢ ὡς v 6 νάσιβες R 7 νέσιβες R 8 νάσιβες R ὁ δὲ P ὡς δὲ RV νέσιβες R 16-19 οἱ χαλδαῖοι τὸν θεὸν ἰαὼ λέγουσιν ἀντὶ – δημιουργός X ὅτι Ηαω (so!) παρὰ Χαλδαίοις ἑρμηνεύεται φῶς νοητὸν τῆι Φοινίκων γλώσσηι Kedren. p. 296, 19 Bonn. 18 ὥς φησιν Ἑρέννιος om. X 24: s. zu p. 815, 9 30 ἐγκατέταξεν: s. Euseb. *P.E.* 9, 7 31-32 λέγεται – ἀγαγεῖν: Joseph. *c. Ap.* 1, 161 ff. (737 F 1)

τοῦ ἱστορικοῦ φέρεται Περὶ Ἰουδαίων βιβλίον (264 T 7c), ἐν ὧι προστίθεται μᾶλλόν πως ὡς σοφῶι τῶι ἔθνει ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον, ὡς καὶ Ἑρέννιον Φίλωνα ἐν τῶι Περὶ Ἰουδαίων συγγράμματι πρῶτον μὲν ἀμφιβάλλειν, εἰ τοῦ ἱστορικοῦ ἐστι τὸ σύγγραμμα, δεύτερον δὲ λέγειν ὅτι εἴπερ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ, εἰκὸς αὐτὸν συνηρπάσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις πιθανότητος, καὶ συγκατατεθεῖσθαι αὐτῶν τῶι λόγωι.

10 (5) Euseb. *P.E.* I, 10, 42: (F 2) ὁ δ᾽αὐτὸς ἐν τῶι Περὶ Ἰουδαίων συγγράμματι ἔτι καὶ ταῦτα περὶ τοῦ Κρόνου γράφει·

(43) <<Τάαυτος, ὃν Αἰγύπτιοι προσαγορεύουσι Θωύθ, σοφίαι διενεγκὼν παρὰ τοῖς Φοίνιξι, πρῶτος τὰ κατὰ τὴν θεοσέβειαν ἐκ τῆς τῶν χυδαίων ἀπειρίας εἰς ἐπιστημονικὴν ἐμπειρίαν διέταξεν, ὧι μετὰ γενεὰς πλείους(?) θεὸς Σουρμουβηλὸς Θουρώ τε ἡ μετονομασθεῖσα Χούσαρθις(?) ἀκολουθήσαντες κεκρυμμένην τοῦ Τααύτου καὶ ἀλληγορίαις ἐπεσκιασμένην τὴν θεολογίαν ἐφώτισαν>>.

(44) καὶ μετὰ βραχέα φησίν· <<ἔθος ἦν – κατέθυσεν>> (= F 3b). (Es folgt F 4).

***11** (–) Helladios *Chrestomath.* (Phot. *Bibl.* p. 529 b 27): ὅτι φλυαρεῖ καὶ οὗτος τὸν Μωσῆν Ἄλφα καλεῖσθαι, διότι ἀλφοῖς τὸ σῶμα κατάστικτος ἦν, καὶ καλεῖ τοῦ ψεύδους τὸν Φίλωνα μάρτυρα.

5. ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑΣ ΑΔΡΙΑΝΟΥ

(T I)

6. ΠΑΡΑΔΟΞΟΣ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑ Α̅ – Γ̅

12 (I) Euseb. *P.E.* I, 9, 28: s. F I § 28.

13 (10) Suda s.v. Παλαίφατος Ἀβυδηνός· ἱστορικός (44 T 3) .... γέγονε δὲ ἐπὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνος· παιδικὰ δὲ Ἀριστοτέλους τοῦ φιλοσόφου, ὡς Φίλων ἐν τῶι ε̅ι̅ στοιχείωι τοῦ Περὶ παραδόξου ἱστορίας βιβλίου α̅ καὶ Θεόδωρος ὁ Ἰλιεὺς ἐν δευτέρωι Τρωικῶν (48 F I).

7. ΠΕΡΙ ΧΡΗΣΤΟΜΑΘΙΑΣ

14 (p. 560) Et. Gen. (Et. M. p. 227, 52; Et. Gud. p. 306, 16 Stef) s.v. γέρανος· ὁ ὄμβρος ὑπὸ Κυρηναίων παρὰ τὸ τὴν γῆν ῥαίνειν· οὕτως Ἑρέννιος Φίλων ἐν τῶι Περὶ χρηστομαθίας· φησὶ δὲ τὴν δευτέραν δασύνεσθαι.

---

6 αὐτῶν Bohéreau αὐτῶι O 7-8 ὁ δ᾽ – γράφει om. B 8 ἔτι καὶ ταῦτα: s. F I § 21? 9-15: cf. F I § 24/6 9 τάαυτος BO ταυθός A προσαγ. θ̅ω̅υ̅θ̅ A θὼθ πρ. BO 11 τῶν om. B 12 ὧι BO ὡς A πλείους A πλείστας B^2O πλείστους B^1 13 χούσαρθις BO εὔσαρθις A 25-28 om. AF (V fehlt) 27-28 [ἐν τῶι ε̅ι̅ στοιχείωι] Kuester ἐν τῶι * στοιχείωι τοῦ [περὶ π. ἱ.] α̅ βιβλίου Bernhardy 27 ει GM ε S ν ῡ Eudok; s. Rohde *Kl. Schr.* I p. 365 n. 2 στοιχείωι: στίχωι He, Nauck 28 βιβλίου Eudok βιβλίον GMS

8. ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΛΕΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΟΥΣ ΕΚΑΣΤΗ ΑΥΤΩΝ ΕΝΔΟΞΟΥΣ ΗΝΕΓΚΕΝ Α̅-Λ̅ (T1; 4)

15 (16) Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀμισός· .... ἐν τῶι Πόντωι ... <τὸ ἐθνικὸν> Ἀμισηνός. λέγεται καὶ Ἀμίσιος, ὡς Φίλων ἐν τῶι Περὶ πόλεων.

16 (14) Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀνδανία· πόλις Μεσσήνης ὁμώνυμος τῆι χώραι· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ ἡ Μεσσήνη Ἀνδανία ἐκαλεῖτο, ἣν οἰκίσαι φασί τινας τῶν μετὰ Κρεσφόντου, καὶ οὕτω καλέσαι διὰ τὸ μὴ ἀνδάνειν αὐτοῖς. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Ἀνδανιεύς, ὡς Φίλων ἐν τῆι Περὶ πόλεων. ἐκ ταύτης Ἀριστομένης ἐγένετο, ἐπιφανέστατος στρατηγός ..... λέγεται δὲ καὶ Ἀνδάνιος ὡς Ῥιανός (265 F 46).

17 (18a) Et. Gen. (Et. M. p. 149, 50) s.v. Ἀρσινόη· πόλις ἐν Συρίαι ἐπὶ βουνῶι κειμένη· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ βουνοῦ πηγὰς ἐξερεύγεσθαι πλείονας, καὶ ποταμοὺς γίνεσθαι μεγάλους, ἀφ' ὧν ἡ πόλις ὠνόμασται· ἄρσαι γὰρ τὸ ποτίσαι, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ἄρσην ὁ τὴν γυναῖκα ποτίζων ἐν τῆι σποραῖ. οὕτως Σερῆνος ἐν τῆι Ἐπιτομῆι τῶν Φίλωνος.

18 (18b) Et. Gen. (Et. M. p. 207, 42) s.v. Βουκεραίς· κρήνη ἐν Πλαταιαῖς, ἥτις ὠνομάσθη ὅτι Πόλυβος ἐξ Ἄργους ἐπέκτισεν Πλαταιὰς μετὰ τὸν ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος κατακλυσμόν, βοὸς αὐτοῦ ἡγουμένης κατὰ χρησμόν, ὥς ποτε Κάδμου, ἣν ἐκεῖσε κατακλιθεῖσαν τῶι κέρατι πατάξαι τὴν γῆν· καὶ κρήνην ἀναφανῆναι, ἣν ἀπὸ τοῦ κέρατος τῆς βοὸς Βουκεραΐδα καλεῖσθαι. οὕτως Θέων ἐν τῶι ὑπομνήματι τοῦ ᾱ Αἰτίων Καλλιμάχου (F 42 Pf). οὕτω καὶ Σερῆνος ἐν τῆι Ἐπιτομῆι τῶν Φίλωνος Περὶ πόλεων, Πολύιδον λέγων τὸν λαβόντα τὸν χρησμόν.

OHNE BUCHTITEL

19 (12) Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀγάθη· πόλις Λιγύων ἢ Κελτῶν· Σκύμνος (206 ff.) δὲ Φωκαέων αὐτήν φησιν ἐν τῆι Εὐρώπηι ..... ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλη πόλις, ὡς Φίλων, Λ<ιγ>υστίων ἐπὶ λίμνης Λ<ιγ>υστίας· τάχα δὲ ἡ αὐτή ἐστι τῆι πρώτηι, ὡς Εὔδοξος (V)· βαρύνεται δέ. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Ἀγαθῖνος ....

20 (14) Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀζανία· μέρος τῆς Ἀρκαδίας ..... καὶ ἔχει ἡ Ἀζανία πόλεις ι̅ζ̅, ἃς ἔλαχεν Ἀζήν. ἔστι καὶ Μασσαλίας (?) ἄλλη, ὡς Φίλων.

3-4 <τὸ ἐθν.> Berkel 4 ἀμ^{ι}ηνός R^1 ἀμισίσιος V 5 μεσήνης o 6 οἰκίσαι PR^c -ῖσαι V -ῆσαι R^{ac} 7 αὐτοῖς P αὐτούς RV 19 ὥς B καὶ A τῶι κέρατι Et. M. τῆς κέρατος AB 21 τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι (ὑπομνήσεως DM) Et. M. Αἰτίων Syl αἰτίου o 21-23 οὕτω – χρησμόν om. B 25 Λιγύων ἢ v λιγυώνη RVP 27 Λιγυστίων Xyl λυστίων o Λιγυστίνων Holste ἐπὶ Schubart ἀπὸ o Λιγυστίας Xyl λυστίας o 28 Εὔδοξος Xyl εὐδόξιος o βαρύνεται τὸ (om. δὲ) V 30 μασαλίας P Αἰθιοπίας Berkel Ἀζανία Ἀραβίας o. Λιβύης o.ä. (Peripl. M. Er. 15 ff.; Ptolem. 1, 17, 5)?

21 (14) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἀθῆναι· πόλεις κατὰ μὲν Ὧρον ε̄, κατὰ δὲ Φίλωνα ϛ̄.

22 (16) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Αἴγειρα· πόλις Ἀχαίας . . . . . . Φίλων δέ φησι Κιλικίας πόλιν εἶναι Αἴγειραν.

23 (16) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἁλικαρνασσός· πόλις Καρίας . . . . . . ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ Ἰσθμὸς καὶ Ζεφύριον, ὡς Φίλων, καὶ Ζεφυρία.

***24** (–) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἀλόπη· πόλις Θεσσαλίας, ἀπὸ Ἀλόπης τῆς Κερκυόνος, ὡς Φερεκύδης (3 F 147), ἢ τῆς Ἄκτορος, ὡς Φίλων· ἔστι δὲ μεταξὺ Λαρίσσης τῆς Κρεμαστῆς καὶ Ἐχίνου. β̄ ἔστι καὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς Ἀλόπη· γ̄ Ποντου, ἀφ' ἧς Πενθεσίλεια· δ̄ περὶ Εὔβοιαν· ε̄ περὶ Δελφούς· ϛ̄ περὶ Λοκρίδα.

25 (14) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἄνθεια· πόλις Πελοποννήσου πλησίον Ἄργους, ὡς Φίλων. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Ἀνθεύς. ἔστιν Ἄνθεια καὶ τοῦ Πόντου πόλις πρὸς τῆι Θράικηι . . . ἧς μέμνηνται πολλοὶ καὶ Φιλέας (V). ἔστι καὶ κώμη Λιβύης. ἔστι καὶ Ἰταλίας Ῥώμης πλησίον, ἥτις καὶ Ἄντιον μετωνομάσθη, ὡς εἰρήσεται.

26 (16) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἄντισσα· πόλις Λέσβου ἐφεξῆς τῶι Σιγρίωι, ἀφ' ἧς Τέρπανδρος ὁ Ἀντισσαῖος, διασημότατος κιθαρωιδός· ἀπὸ Ἀντίσσης τῆς Μάκαρος θυγατρὸς ἐν τοῖς Φίλωνος. ἔστι καὶ νῆσος μία τῶν Κυκλάδων· καὶ γ̄ Ἰνδικῆς, ἣν ἀναγράφει Φίλων καὶ Δημοδάμας ὁ Μιλήσιος (428 F 3).

27 (15) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἄργουρα· πόλις Θεσσαλίας ἡ πρότερον Ἄργισσα. ἔστι καὶ τόπος τῆς Εὐβοίας Ἄργουρα, ὅπου δοκεῖ τὸν Πανόπτην Ἑρμῆς πεφονευκέναι. τὸ ἐθνικὸν ἔδει Ἀργουραῖος, ὡς καὶ Φίλων· Ἀπολλόδωρος (244 F 154) δέ φησιν . . . Ἀργείους ὀνομάζεσθαι . . . .

28 (13) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἀρτέμιτα· νῆσος Τυρρηνικὴ παρὰ τὴν ‹Αἰ›θάλειαν νῆσον, ὡς Φίλων.

29 (18) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἀσπίς· πόλις Λιβύης, ὡς Φίλων.

30 (17) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Βαβυλών· Περσικὴ πόλις, μητρόπολις, Σελεύκεια καλουμένη. κτίσμα Βαβυλῶνος, ἀνδρὸς σοφωτάτου, παιδὸς Βήλου, Φοιν.? παλαίτατον, οὐχ ὡς Ἡρόδοτος (1, 184?) ὑπὸ Σεμιράμιδος· ταύτης γὰρ ἦν ἀρχαιοτέρα ἔτεσι αβ, ὡς Ἑρέννιος. ἔστι καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτωι πόλις.

---

3 φίλην V 4 ‹καὶ› Κιλικίας? Mei πόλις P εἶναι R εἶπεν VP ἄλγειραν P 6 ζεφύριον RV ζεφύρια P ζεφυρία RP -ρίων V 8 Φίλων Mei φιλωνίδης o 9 ἔστι τῆς R Ἀττικῆς: Hesych. s.v. Ἀλόπη ἐν Ἄργει καὶ κρήνη ἐν Ἐλευσῖνι, ἥτις Φιλότης ἐκαλεῖτο 10 πενθεσίλεια P πενθεσίλεια RV 12 ἄνθα V 14 φιλήας V 20 καὶ γ̄ RP ϛ̄γ V 23 ἀργούρουρα P 24 ἑρμῆν V δὲ ἔδει R 26 ἀρτέμιτα V ἀρτέμήτα (so) R ἀρτεμίτα (?) P 29-30 Σελεύκεια v σελευκ' R σελευκία VP 30 Βήλου (Pal?) Salm μήδου o Eust. Dion. Per. 1005 31 ὡς om. V 32 αβ o χιλίοις ὀκτακοσίοις Eust Ἑρέννιος v ἐρρένιος RP ἐρένιος V

31 (16) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Βόσπορος· πόλις Πόντου κατὰ τὸν Κιμμέριον κόλπον, ὡς **Φίλων**, καὶ πορθμὸς ὁμώνυμος ἀπὸ Ἰοῦς <τῆς Ἰνάχου> καλούμενος, <καθὼς> Αἰσχύλος ἐν Προμηθεῖ δεσμώτηι (732/4) <γράφει>. Φοιν.?

32 (15) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Βουθόη· πόλις Ἰλλυρίδος, ὡς **Φίλων**, διὰ τὸ Κάδμον ἐπὶ ζεύγους βοῶν ὀχούμενον ταχέως ἀνύσαι τὴν ἐς Ἰλλυριοὺς ὁδόν· οἱ δὲ τὸν Κάδμον ἀπὸ τῆς Αἰγυπτίας Βουτοῦς ὀνομάσαι αὐτήν, καὶ παραφθαρεῖσαν καλεῖσθαι Βουθόην. Φοιν.?

33 (14) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Βοῦρα· πόλις Ἀχαΐας· θηλυκῶς· ἀπὸ Βούρας θυγατρὸς Ἴωνος τοῦ Ξούθου καὶ Ἑλίκης. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Βουραῖος· Λυκόφρων (*Al.* 591) <<Δύμη τε Βουραίοισιν ἡγεμὼν στόλου>>. ἐκ ταύτης ἦν Πυθέας ζωγράφος, οὗ ἐστιν ἔργον ὁ ἐν Περγάμωι ἐλέφας, ἀπὸ τοιχογραφίας ὤν, ὡς **Φίλων**.

34 (17) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Γέρασα· πόλις τῆς Κοίλης Συρίας τῆς δεκαπόλεως. ἐξ αὐτῆς Ἀρίστων ῥήτωρ ἀστεῖός ἐστιν, ὡς **Φίλων**, καὶ Κήρυκος σοφιστὴς καὶ Πλάτων νομικὸς ῥήτωρ, πᾶσαν παίδευσιν ὡς μίαν ἀποστοματίζων καὶ ἐν συνηγορίαις καὶ παρεδρευταῖς καὶ θρόνοις τὴν ὀρθότητα τῶν νόμων ἐπιτηδεύων.

35 (15) STEPH. BYZ. (plen.) s.v. Δυρράχιον· πόλις Ἰλλυρική, Ἐπίδαμνος κληθεῖσα ἀπὸ Ἐπιδάμνου. τούτου θυγάτηρ Μέλισσα, ἧς καὶ Ποσειδῶνος Δυρράχιος· ἀφ' ἧς ἐστιν ἐν Ἐπιδάμνωι τόπος Μελισσώνιος, ἔνθα Ποσειδῶν αὐτῆι συνῆλθεν, <ὡς **Φίλων**. Στράβων δ'ἐν ζ (5, 8) φησί>· <<μετὰ δὲ τὸν Ῥιζονικὸν <κόλπον> Λίσσος ἐστὶ πόλις καὶ Ἀκρόλισσος καὶ Ἐπίδαμνος, Κερκυραίων κτίσμα, ἡ νῦν Δυρράχιον ὁμωνύμως τῆι χερρονήσωι [πρότερον] λεγομένη, ἐφ' ἧς ἵδρυται, [ὡς Φίλων]. F 53.

36 (13) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἔγεστα· πόλις Σικελίας, ἔνθα θερμὰ ὕδατα, ὡς **Φίλων**. ἀπὸ Ἐγέστου τοῦ Τρωός.

37 (17) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἐλαία (SCHOL. EUST. DION. PER. 910)· ..... ἔστι καὶ πόλις Φοινίκης Ἐλαία μεταξὺ Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος, ὡς **Φίλων** ..... Φοιν.?

---

2 ὡς Φίλων om. Const. Porph. *De them.* 2, 12   2-3 < > aus Const   3 δεσμώτηι P δεσπότηι RV om. Const   4 βουθόην P   Ἰλλυρίδος Xyl -ιάδος o   6 βουτοὺς RP om. V   8-9 θηλυκῶς – Ἑλίκης om. P   9 ξούθου R ξάνθου V   10 Δύμης Lyk   ἡγεμήν RV   στόλου: στρατοῦ Lyk   13-14 δεκαπόλεως (Plin. *N.H.* 5, 74; 77) Salm τεσσαρεσκαιδεκαπόλεως o   14 ἀστεῖος ὡς P   16-17 παρεδρίαις Berkel   18-19 καὶ Ἐπίδαμνος Const. Porph. *De them.* 2, 9   19 ὑπὸ Ἐπιδάμνου τοῦ ἀρχαίου ἥρωος Const   19-20 ποσειδῶνος S τὸ ποσ. RVP τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος Xyl   20 δυρράχιος S(P?) ὁ δυρράχιος Const δυρραχὶς(?) RV(cp.)   21-24 <ὡς Φίλων. Στράβων δ'ἐν η̄ (so!) φησί> – [ὡς Φίλων] Mei   22 <κόλπον> Strab   23 [πρότερον] (om. Strab) v   24 ὡς Στράβων? Mue   26 αἰγέστου τοῦ τρῶος RV   28 φοινίκη Schol   Ἐλαία o Schol Ἐλαΐς Dion. Per. 910, Eust (οὕτω λέγεται διὰ τὸ ἐλαιοφόρος εἶναι)

38 (17) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Ἰόπη· πόλις Φοινίκης πλησίον Ἰαμνίας, ὡς Φίλων· ὡς δὲ Διονύσιος (*Per.* 910) Παλαιστίνης· Φοινίκη γὰρ καὶ ἡ Παλαιστίνη. ἐκλήθη δὲ ἀπὸ Ἰόπης τῆς Αἰόλου θυγατρός, τῆς γυναικὸς Κηφέως τοῦ κτίσαντος καὶ βασιλεύσαντος – τοῦ καταστερισθέντος, οὗ ἐστι γυνὴ Κασσιέπεια· οἱ Ἕλληνες κακῶς φασιν –, ἀφ' οὗ Κηφῆνες οἱ Αἰθίοπες. ἔστι καὶ Θεσσαλίας ἄλλη. Φοιν.?

39 (14) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Κῦνος· ἐπίνειον Ὀποῦντος, ὡς Φίλων καὶ Παυσανίας (10, 1, 2)· Ἑκαταῖος (1 F 131) δὲ πόλιν αὐτήν φησιν.

40 (14) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Λάμπη· πόλις Κρήτης . . . . . καὶ γ̄ τῆς Ἀργολίδος, ὡς Φίλων.

41 (17) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Λαοδίκεια· πόλις τῆς Συρίας, ἡ πρότερον Λευκὴ ἀκτὴ λεγομένη καὶ πρὸ τούτου Ῥάμιθα· κεραυνωθεὶς γάρ τις(?) ἐν αὐτῆι ποιμὴν ἔλεγε 'ῥαμάνθας', τουτέστιν ἀφ' ὕψους ὁ θεός· ῥάμαν γὰρ τὸ ὕψος, ἄθας δὲ ὁ θεός. οὕτως Φίλων. Φοιν.?

42 (17) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Μαρσύα· πόλις Φοινίκης, ὡς Ἀλέξανδρος (273 F 128) καὶ Φίλων, ἀπὸ † Μαρσοῦ. Φοιν.?

43 (11) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Μεγάλη πόλις· . . . . . ἔστι καὶ Ἰβηρίας Μεγάλη πόλις, ὡς Φίλων.

44 (–) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Μεθύδριον· πόλις Ἀρκαδίας . . . . ἔστι καὶ ἑτέρα πόλις Θεσσαλίας, ὡς Φίλων.

45 (15) STEPH. BYZ. s.v. Μελίταια· πόλις Θεσσαλίας· Ἀλέξανδρος Ἀσίαι (V)· Θεόπομπος (115 F 373) δὲ Μελίτειαν αὐτήν φησιν. ὁ πολίτης Μελιταιεύς. Ἔφορος λ̄ (70 F 95)· 'οἱ δὲ τύραννοι τῶν Φερῶν καὶ Μελιταιεῖς φίλοι πρότερον ὑπάρχοντες'.

Μελίτεια· Φίλων οὕτω γράφει, τὰ αὐτὰ πράγματα τῆι εἰρημένηι προσάπτων. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Μελιτεύς(?). Φοιν.?

Μελίτη· νῆσος μεταξὺ Ἠπείρου καὶ Ἰταλίας, ὅθεν τὰ κυνίδια Μελιταῖά

1-6: s. Komm. 1-2 Ἰαμνίας: aus Ph. auch s.v. Ἰάμνια· πολίχνιον Φοινίκης – Στράβων (16, 2, 28) δὲ κώμην φησίν – ἀπὸ Ἰάμνου ἢ ὅτι ἰάμνους ἐκάλουν τοὺς καθύγρους καὶ τεθηλότας τόπους? 3 ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰοῦς ἢ ἀπὸ Ἰόπης Eust. Dion. Per. 910 11 Λαοδίκεια πόλις om. V τῆς om. R 12 ῥάμιθαι V ῥάμαθα Eust. Dion. Per. 915 12-13 γὰρ τούτις R (ι in ras.) γάρ πού τις? Mei (korrupter) eigenname? 13 ἐν αὐτῆι om. P(V?) ποιμὴν VP Eust om. R ἔλεγε: ἀνεβόα Eust ῥαμανάθας Salm 14 ῥάμαν (lac. ind.) om. V γὰρ παρ' ἐγχωρίοις Eust ἄθας RVP ἀθάν Eust ἄνθας Bochart 15 μαρσία R 16 μαρσοῦ RV μάρσου P Μαρσύου Berkel; s. Honigmann *RE* XIV col. 1986, 6 ff. 17 ἰβιρίας P 19 ἔστι δὲ καὶ P 20 Θεσσαλίας om. P(?) φίλων ο Φιλόξενος Ald 21-p. 823, 2: drei artikel (o); verwirrt 21 Μελίταια Mei μελιτταία ο Μελιταιά Berkel 22 Ἀσίαι: Εὐρώπηι? Mei 23 μελιταεῖς PR^{c}(?) μελιτταεῖς V 25-26 Μελίτεια – Μελιτεύς gehören zu 27-823, 1 (hinter Καρχηδονίων); mit 21-24 verbanden Berkel, Mei, Mue 27 Ἰταλίας. <ἔστι καὶ ἄλλη πλησίον Σικελίας>, ὅθεν Holste φασιν. ὁ οἰκήτωρ Μελιταῖος. ἔστι καὶ πόλις ἄποικος Καρχηδονίων· καὶ δῆμος Οἰνηίδος φυλῆς. ὁ δημότης Μελιτεύς.

46 (16) Steph. Byz. s.v. Μυοῦς· πόλις Ἰωνίας, ὡς **Φίλων** καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος ἐν ᾱ Χρονικῶν (244 F 1).

47 (16) Steph. Byz. s.v. Ὀλβία· πόλις Λιγυστική .... β̄ πόλις ἐν Πόντωι· γ̄ Βιθυνίας ἀπὸ Ὀλβίας νύμφης· δ̄ Παμφυλίας, ὡς **Φίλων** – οὐκ ἔστι δὲ Παμφυλίας ἀλλὰ τῆς τῶν Σολύμων γῆς καὶ οὐδὲ Ὀλβία ἀλλὰ Ὄλβα καλεῖται, καὶ οἱ πολῖται Ὀλβαῖοι καὶ Ὄλβιος καὶ Ὀλβία –· ε̄ Ἰβηρίας· ϛ̄ Σαρδοῦς· ζ̄ Ἰλλυρίδος· η̄ Ἑλλησπόντου· θ̄ Κιλικίας.

48 (16) Steph. Byz. s.v. Τελμησσός· πόλις Καρίας· ὡς δὲ **Φίλων** καὶ Στράβων (14, 3, 4) Λυκίας. ἔστι γὰρ ἀμφοτέρων ὅριον μετὰ Δαίδαλα.

49 (16) Steph. Byz. s.v. Τίος· πόλις Παφλαγονίας τοῦ Πόντου· ἀπὸ Τίου ἱερέως τὸ γένος Μιλησίου, ὡς **Φίλων**. Δημοσθένης δὲ ἐν Βιθυνιακοῖς (699 F 9) φησι κτίστην τῆς πόλεως γενέσθαι Πάταρον ἑλόντα Παφλαγονίαν, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τιμᾶν τὸν Δία Τίον προσαγορεῦσαι.

50 (14) Steph. Byz. s.v. Φαραί· πόλις Μεσσήνης, ὅθεν ἦσαν οἱ Ἀφαρητιάδαι ..... εἰσὶ καὶ Φαραὶ Βοιωτίας ... ἔστι δ᾽ ἄλλη Κρήτης, ἄποικος τῆς ἐν Μεσσήνηι, ὡς **Φίλων**.

51 (–) Suda s.v. Φιλιστίων· Προυσαεὺς ἢ, ὡς **Φίλων**, Σαρδιανός· κωμικός.

9. ΠΕΡΙ ΚΤΗΣΕΩΣ ΚΑΙ ΕΚΛΟΓΗΣ ΒΙΒΛΙΩΝ Α̅-Ι̅Β̅.

(T 1; F 54? 55?)

Θ̄ (ΙΑΤΡΟΙ)

52 (19) **a**) Steph. Byz. s.v. Κύρτος· πόλις Αἰγύπτου ἐν τῶι μεσογείωι. ἐκ ταύτης Διονύσιος ἦν διάσημος ἰατρός, ἀπὸ τῆς πατρίδος, οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος Κυρτὸς ὀνομαζόμενος, οὗ μέμνηται Ἑρέννιος **Φίλων** ἐν τῶι Περὶ ἰατρῶν. ὁ τόνος τοῦ μὲν ἐθνικοῦ ὀξύς, ὁμόφωνος τῶι πάθει, τοῦ δὲ κυρίου τῆς πόλεως βαρύς, ὡς τὸ κόντος (?) καὶ πόντος. **b**) Schol. Oreibasios III p. 132 Raeder: οἱ περὶ Διονύσιον τὸν Κυρτόν] ὁ **Φίλων** ἐν τῶι θ̄ Περὶ βιβλιοθήκης κτήσεως καὶ Ἕρμιππος (IV) ἐν τῶι ε̄ Περὶ τῶν διὰ παιδείαν σεμνηθέντων ἐνδόξων ἀνδρῶν ἰατρῶν καὶ ὁ Σωρανὸς ἐν ταῖς τῶν

---

1 καὶ πόλις del. R^{1} ἔστι <καὶ ἄλλη νῆσος> καὶ πόλις Klüwer 6 φίλων o Φιλόξενος Ald 7-8 ἀλλὰ – Ὀλβία om. V 10 Τελμησσός v -μισσός o 10-11 καὶ Στράβων Xyl, v ἢ Στ. o 11 ἀμφοτέρων Xyl ἀμφότερα o (?) 13 (18) $\overset{\lambda}{\text{φι}}$ P 16 (18) μεσήνης o 16-17 Ἀφαρητιάδαι Xyl ἀφαριτιάδαι P φαριτιᾶδαι R φαρητιάδαι V 26 ἑρέννιος R ἑρρέννιος V^{c} ἑρρένιος P 27 ἰατρικῶν P ἐθνικοῦ Salm ἑνικοῦ o(?) 28 πόντος καὶ κόντος P κόστος? Mei 30 κτήσεως o κτίσεως Schol Ἕρμιππος v ἕρμηπος Hs 31 παιδίαν Hs ἐνδόξων v εὐδόξων Hs [ἰατρῶν]?

Ἰατρῶν Διαδοχαῖς φασιν, ὅτι καὶ ὀξυτόνως εἴρηται κυρτὸς ὡς φοξὸς διὰ σωματικὴν ἀσθένειαν, βαρυτόνως δὲ ὡς ἵππος, πύργος, ἐπεὶ ἐκ μεσογαίου πόλεως τῆς Αἰγύπτου λεγομένης Κύρτου ὑπῆρχεν· ἢ ὥς φασί τινες, διὰ τὸ ἁλίσκεσθαι τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας <ὑπ'> αὐτοῦ ὥσπερ τοὺς ἰχθῦς ὑπὸ τῶν ἁλιευτικῶν κύρτων.

53 (20) Steph. Byz. (plen.) s.v. Δυρράχιον· . . . . . ὅμως δὲ νῦν Δυρραχηνοὶ λέγονται· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ Βάλαγρος ἐν Μακεδονικοῖς (773 F 2) φησι . . . . καὶ Ἑρέννιος Φίλων ἐν·τοῖς Ἰατροῖς Δυρραχηνὸν ἀναγράφει Φιλωνίδην οὕτως· <<Ἀσκληπιάδης ἀκουστὰς ἔσχε Τῖτον Αὐφίδιον Σικελὸν καὶ Φιλωνίδην Δυρραχηνὸν καὶ Νίκωνα Ἀκραγαντῖνον>>. καὶ πάλιν· <<Φιλωνίδης δὲ ὁ Δυρραχηνὸς ἤκουσε μὲν Ἀσκληπιάδου, ἰατρεύσας δὲ ἐν τῆι πατρίδι ἐνδόξως συνετάξατο βιβλία μ̅ε̅>>.

10. VERSCHIEDENES

54 (–) Suda s.v. Φίλων Βύβλιος: s. T 1 p. 802, 21.

55 (p. 560 **) Lydus *De magistr.* 1, 12 p. 17, 6 Wü: ἐν γὰρ ταῖς Εἰκόσι Τερέντιος ὁ ἐπίκλην Βάρρων – τὸ δὲ Βάρρωνος ἐπώνυμον τὸν ἀνδρεῖον κατὰ τὴν Κελτῶν φωνήν, κατὰ δὲ Φοίνικας τὸν Ἰουδαῖον σημαίνει, ὡς Ἑρέννιός φησιν – . . . .

56 (15a) Eustath. Dion. Per. 752: ὅτι Φροῦροι Σκυθικὸν ἔθνος βαρυτόνως πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τοῦ φρουροί, ὅπερ ὀξυνόμενον δηλοῖ τοὺς φύλακας· τινὲς δὲ Φρῦνοι γράφουσιν ὁμωνύμως τῶι ζώιωι· φρῦνοι γάρ, καθὰ καὶ ὁ Φίλων γράφει, οἱ βάτραχοι.

57 (–) Eustath. Hom. *Il.* Λ 430 p. 855, 4: αἶνος καὶ παροιμία διαφέρουσιν, καθὸ ὁ μὲν αἶνος λόγος ἐστὶ μυθικὸς ἐκφερόμενος ἀπὸ ἀλόγων ζώιων ἢ φυτῶν πρὸς ἀνθρώπων παραίνεσιν, ὥς φησι Λούκιλλος ὁ Ταρραῖος (IV) ἐν πρώτωι Παροιμιῶν· ἀπὸ μὲν ἀλόγων, ὡς παρὰ Ἀρχιλόχωι (F 89 D) . . . καὶ Ἡσίοδος (*Opp.* 202) . . .· ἀπὸ δὲ φυτῶν ὡς παρὰ Καλλιμάχωι (F 194, 6 Pf) . . . . καὶ ἔστιν ὁ αἶνος ἐξηπλωμένη παροιμία καὶ οὕτω μὲν καὶ τοῦτο κατεστρωμένον οὕτω ῥητῶς ἐν τοῖς Ἑρεννίου Φίλωνος.

---

4 <ὑπ'> Daremberg(?) 8 ἑρέννιος S^cVP ἑρρ- R(?) ἰατροῖς S.RVP Ἰατρικοῖς v 12 ἐνδόξως S^c εὐδόξως· RVP 17-19: *De magistr.* 1, 23 p. 27, 1 Wü (ohne autornamen) 19 Ἑρέννιος Fuss ερέννιοι (so!) O 24-29 (παροιμία): Ammon. *De diff. voc.* p. 9 ff.

CHAPTER THREE

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

i

Translation of Texts Discussed

(802: 15) Philo of Byblos. A scholar. He was born in the times close to those of Nero and he lived a long life. (802: 17) He himself says that the Severus who was called Erennius was consul[1] when he [Philo] was seventy-eight years old, in the 220th Olympiad. (802: 19) A work in twelve books, *Concerning the Acquisition and Selection of Books*, was written by him, [and one in] thirty books, *Concerning Cities and the Illustrious Men Each of Them Produced.* [He also wrote] *Concerning the Reign of Hadrian* (during whose time Philo flourished), and other books.[2]

(802: 22) Hermippos of Beirut. He came from an inland village. He was a disciple of Philo of Byblos, who introduced him to Erennius Severus during Hadrian's reign. (802: 23) Although he was the child of a slave he was exceedingly learned and wrote much. He also wrote *Concerning Dreams.*

(802: 25) Paul of Tyre. An orator. He flourished at the time of

---

[1] On the rendering of χρηματίζω see Bickerman, "Christians," pp. 111-112.

[2] Jacoby, perhaps following Westermann, *BGM*, p. 380, omits part of this notice retained by all other editors. The passage concludes the entry on Philo and reads as follows: ὅτι ὕπατος γέγονε ὁ Φίλων Ἐρέννιος χρηματίσας ὡς αὐτός φησι: "that Philo, who called himself Erennius, was consul as he himself says." These lines are garbled at best and Kuster was tempted to remove the words ὕπατος γέγονε as an interpolation from the mention of the consul Erennius Severus above. The passage would then simply state that Philo called himself Herennius (see n. 9). Kuster, *Suidae Lexicon*, Vol: 3, p. 613. Jacoby does not explain why he omitted these lines from both the body and critical apparatus of his text, nor does Westermann. Perhaps they took Kuster's position a step further and considered the entire passage an interpolation or better a misplaced comment on 802: 17. At the very least, Kuster is correct and it is likely that so are Jacoby and Westermann. I have accordingly followed Jacoby.

Philo of Byblos. Having been sent as an ambassador to the Emperor Hadrian, he secured the status of Metropolis for the city of Tyre.[3]

(802 : 26) Herodian of Alexandria. A scholar. The son of Apollonius ... surnamed Dyskolos. (803: 1) He flourished during the reign of the Emperor Marcus Antonius and thus was younger than Dionysius (the one who wrote the *History of Poetry Sung to Music*), and than Philo of Byblos.

(803: 3) *The Phoenician History*,[4] which Sanchuniathon wrote in the Phoenician language, and Philo of Byblos translated into the Greek language in eight books.

(803: 6) Serenos. Also called Athenaios, who took the name Ailios. He was a scholar and wrote a condensation in three books of Philo's work *Concerning Cities and who were the Illustrious Men of Each.*

ii

Suidas' entry is the primary source of biographical information on Philo,[5] but it is difficult to utilize for three reasons: (1) the meaning of key terms—γέγονε and εἶναι—is uncertain; (2) numerals in manuscripts were most susceptible to corruption, hence one cannot rely on the ages or dates given; (3) we do not know when Herennius Severus was consul.

---

[3] This must be an error, as Tyrian coins bear the legend Μητροπολέως before, during, and after Hadrian's reign, and there is no noticeable gap in such coins. See for example Hill, *BMC Phoenicia*, Tyre, # 290 (94/5 A.D.); 331 (98/9); 338 (104/5); 339 (107/8); 340 (108/9); 315 (112/3); 294 (115/6); 344 (117/8); 346 (121/2); 296 (130/1); 298 (137/8); 321 (139/40). See also Chehab, "Tyr," pp. 20 & 31. There is thus either an error as to the emperor to whom Paul went as ambassador, or as to the purpose and results of the embassy. Cf. *HA* Hadrian, 14,1 and Weber, *Untersuchungen Hadrian*, pp. 232-233.

[4] Eissfeldt has suggested translating ἱστορία in 803: 3 as "knowledge or information (*künde*)," and not as "history." Philo's work, as reflected in Eusebius' citations, he argues, is arranged not historically but topically. Furthermore, there is no real "history," only religion and myth in Philo. Eissfeldt, "Art und Aufbau," p. 90. Eissfeldt's proposal, however, is based on ignoring Philo's Euhemerism which transforms myth into "history." See also Chapter Ten, p. 260. I have therefore retained the ordinary meaning of ἱστορία.

[5] The correct usage is, of course, "the Suda," as the title of the work and not Suidas, as the supposed author's name. I have nevertheless chosen to retain the common usage in the hope of simplifying identification and reference.

The first difficulty was noted by Rohde, who proved that γέγονε and εἶναι are normally used as synonyms of latin *floruit* in the *Lexicon.*[6] When Rohde applied these meanings in our passage he recognized the difficulties created: Philo's acme was now supposedly specified twice, once at the beginning as around the times of Nero, and once at the end as at the time of Hadrian (802: 21). Rohde attempted to avoid this difficulty by hypothesizing that Suidas was generally unaware of the Flavians, particularly of Domitian, and compressed the time between Nero and Trajan.[7] This hypothesis, however, does not really resolve the difficulties created by Rohde's interpretation; for even if accepted it cannot explain why Philo's acme would be specified as at the times of Nero and *Hadrian.*

Our passage must therefore be one of the few in the *Lexicon* in which γέγονε indicates birth.[8] If so, two points are clear: (1) Philo was born around Nero's reign (802: 15-16), survived to write about Hadrian (802: 20), and to introduce Hermippos of Beirut to Herennius Severus during Hadrian's reign (802: 23); (2) Philo's patron, Herennius Severus, was a high Roman official and Philo mentioned his age at the time of Herennius' consulship.[9] If these points are certain, the difficulty in Suidas' entry on Philo can be precisely located: it is in the statement that Philo was 78 when Herennius was consul in 01. 220 = 101/4 A.D. (802: 18). If Philo had been 78 in 101/4 he would have been born in 23-26 A.D. which contradicts the statement (802: 15-16) that he was born around Nero's reign (54-68 A.D.). Thus either age 78 or 01. 220, or both, are wrong. If we knew when Herennius was consul this might shed light on the problem, but we do not.[10]

---

[6] Rohde, *KS*, Vol. 1, pp. 130-132. Rohde rejects Schone's contention that γέγονε refers to birth, Schone, "Untersuchungen Sappho," p. 744. Rohde also showed that Niese's interpretation of our passage was incorrect, and based on an emendation refuted by inscriptions, Niese, *Stephani Byzántii*, p. 28.

[7] Rohde, *KS*, Vol. 1, pp. 129-130.

[8] In spite of Rohde, γέγονε can mean "was born." See Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik*, p. 49.

[9] Philo chose this odd synchronism because of his association with Herennius Severus. Philo's full name was Herennius Philo (817: 18 and 818: 2) and Philo may have been a slave or client of Herennius. When he was either freed or obtained citizenship, Philo would have followed the common practice and taken the latter's name. It is equally possible that one of Philo's ancestors took the name from an ancestor of Philo's Herennius.

In the absence of definite proof, I would offer the following suggestion: Suidas' statements concerning Herodian of Alexandria (803: 1-2), who flourished at the time of Marcus Aurelius and who was younger than Philo of Byblos, would be meaningless had Philo not lived into the second half of the second century A.D. Perhaps Philo was therefore born *after* Nero's reign, ca. 70 A.D. His *floruit* would fall at the end of Trajan's reign or early in Hadrian's (as stated in 802:21); he would have been 78 at the time of Antonius Pius and survived to about the rule of Marcus Aurelius. If this explanation is correct, Westermann's emendation of εἰς μακρόν (802: 16) to εἰς Μάρκον would be quite attractive.[11]

One possible difficulty with this system of dates is posed by a letter of Pliny (4,28). We learn there that a certain T. Herennius Severus, "a most learned *vir*," wanted portraits of C. Nepos and T. Catius for his library. If this is Philo's Herennius Severus it is tempting to believe that Philo, the author of *Concerning the Acquisition and Selection of Books*, a work intended as a guide in the choice of books for a library,[12] aided Herennius in organizing and/or maintaining his library. But there is a chronological difficulty if Philo was not seventy-eight in 101-4 but only sometime during the reign of Hadrian or Antoninus Pius, as proposed above. Pliny's letter dates from 104/5,[13] and Herennius Severus is already a *vir*, a mature man. On the chronology proposed above, Philo would be rather young in 104/5, just over thirty years old. The authority would be younger than his employer, which is odd; one would normally expect the opposite. This objection is not fatal to the dates for Philo proposed. Perhaps Philo was precocious, or as is more likely, perhaps Philo was the friend of some other Herennius Severus, a generation younger than Pliny's contemporary. In any case,

---

[10] The most precise date suggested by Smallwood (in 1966) in her *Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian*, p. 12, is "Hadrianic." See also Troiani, pp. 12-13, n. 11.

[11] Westermann, *BGM*, p. 380.

[12] On Philo's guide to book-collectors see Birt, *Antike Buchwesen*, p. 262. See also Troiani, pp. 22-23.

[13] See Sherwin-White, *Letters*, p. 34.

Pliny's letter is a reminder of the inconclusiveness of any chronological conclusion based on the entries in Suidas. Until there is definite proof one can only be certain that Philo lived sometime in the second half of the first century A.D. and survived at least until the reign of Hadrian.[14]

iii

The data is inadequate for writing a meaningful life of Philo. Information about Philo's circle of friends, as preserved by Suidas, suggests a few interesting conclusions. Philo was part of a group of oriental savants, a group which included Hermippos of Beirut, Paul of Tyre, and Herodian of Alexandria. The consular, Herennius Severus, was apparently their patron, and Philo's friendship with Herennius may have been the link between Near Eastern scholars and Roman rulers (802: 17).

This was a group of extremely learned men: Hermippos of Beirut "was exceedingly learned and wrote much (802: 24)." Philo's works, as noted by Suidas, are consistent with his membership in this scholarly circle. His *Concerning the Acquisition and Selection of Books* must have been based on wide-ranging reading. The fragments we possess from *Concerning Cities and the Illustrious Men each of them Produced* are explicit testimony to Philo's encyclopedic interests and breadth of knowledge.[15]

Philo's circle of friends allows one further insight into his career and writings. Paul of Tyre is mentioned in one of the Acts of the Pagan Martyrs as pleading the case of the Alexandrians against the Jews before Trajan.[16] Philo's comments about Ps. Hecataeus (817: 28-

---

[14] In translating the entry from Suidas, I have adopted the chronology based on birth ca. 70 A.D. and survival to ca. 160 A.D. For a similar conclusion see Gudeman "Herennius," col. 651 and Clemen, p. 1. Cf. Troiani, pp. 12-13. While there is debate concerning when Philo lived, we have no information concerning where he lived. Byblos and Rome are two obvious possibilities.

[15] Troiani, p. 14, esp. n. 13. When Philo writes that the conclusions of the *Phoenician History* are based on extensive reading (805: 16), that is one claim we should not doubt.

[16] P. Oxy, 1242, col. 1, line 9 (p. 44, Musurillo). An opponent of the Jews named Paul is mentioned in another of the Acts; it is uncertain whether this other Paul is Paul of Tyre. See Musurillo, *Acts of the Pagan Martyrs*, p. 187.

818: 6) show that Philo also opposed the Jews. This may have been one of the bonds holding Philo's circle of friends together.[17]

iv

Eusebius of Caesarea (260-340 A.D.), the church historian, is responsible for the preservation, in his *Praeparatio Evangelica*, of the most significant quotations from Philo's *Phoenician History*. Eusebius' purposes in that work and his reliability therefore deserve careful attention.

Eusebius states that his purpose in the *Praeparatio Evangelica* is to show the nature of Christianity and to explain why the Christians have left the ancestral gods and adopted a position that is neither Greek nor Hebrew (4d-5a). By surveying the pagan religions, Eusebius hopes to show that the Christians acted correctly in deserting them (16d). Eusebius will demonstrate the error of paganism by quoting the works of believers in paganism. Thus, he will be free from the suspicion of having invented his arguments (17a).

Eusebius divides pagan theology into the mythical, physical and philosophical. He considers the Phoenicians and Egyptians the originators of mythical theology (17b), and Philo is quoted within this context as the major source on Phoenician theology.[18]

We need not fear that Eusebius's words have been poorly preserved. The manuscript tradition (see the brief summary, above, p. 7) is extensive and ancient. As Henry observes: "*Aucun éditeur d'Eusèbe ne s'est jamais plaint du mauvaise état de la tradition manuscrite de la P.E.*"[19]

Since Eusebius' work is avowedly polemical, and since Eusebius claims that he is proving his own contentions by using the writings of his opponents, his reliability and the accuracy of his quotations must be carefully evaluated. This accuracy and reliability have been challenged, most of all by J. Scaliger who noted Eusebius' "*errata, absurditates, deliria, et halluciationes*—errors, absurdities, delusions and hallucinations."[20]

---

[17] Troiani, pp. 34-37 has tried to relate Philo's opposition to allegory to his dislike of the Jews. For a full discussion of Troiani's position see the commentary on 805: 1-4.

[18] Eissfeldt, *RS*, pp. 91-2 realized this.

[19] Henry, *Eusèbe et Plotin*, p. 54.

[20] *Ap.* Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, p. 3, n. *

Freudenthal, in the nineteenth century, defended Eusebius' reliability.[21] More recently a most remarkable proof has been suggested by Henry.[22] Eusebius quotes Plato, *Theatetus* 173c6-174a2 twice : once directly in *P.E.* 12, 29, 602c and once quoting Clement (*Strom.* 5, 14, 98), who quoted Plato in *P.E.* 13, 13, 672d6. This Platonic passage was quoted by Iamblichus (*Protrep.* 14) and by Theodoretus (*Gr. Aff. Cur.* 12,24-5). A comparison of these citations shows that Eusebius, in the direct quotation, and Iamblichus quote the passage in its entirety, while others omit words and phrases. One example will suffice. In the opening sentence Socrates says to his interlocutor Theodore : λέγωμεν δὴ ὥς ἔοικεν σοί γε δοκεῖ περὶ τῶν κορυφαίων; "Then, if that is your wish, let us speak concerning the leaders." Eusebius' direct citation is the only one not to omit ὥς through δοκεῖ, which recalls the preceding, but not quoted, context of the passage. Furthermore, in Book 13 where Eusebius cites Clement's quotation of Plato, Eusebius agrees with the direct tradition of Clement's works and not with that of Plato. Thus when Eusebius quotes Plato, he is faithful to Plato; when he quotes Clement, he does not "improve" the text by additions from the direct tradition of Plato, but quotes Clement faithfully.

Nor is this surprising. An accurate appreciation of the manner in which a large work, compiled from writings of other authors, would be composed, explains this reliability. Tedious work in libraries, such as the mechanical copying of passages, was done by assistants. Thus Cicero asked Atticus for extra slaves to help him catalogue his library. (*Ad. Att.* IV, 4b). Origen's commentaries on the Bible would not have been written had his patron Ambrose not supplied funds for a large staff of secretaries.[23]

In spite of the fact that Eusebius accurately preserved the words of his sources and did not invent sources, one must remember that his purpose was polemical and that he may have distorted or perverted the original intention of the author he quoted by judicious or injudicious editing or through misleading introductory or concluding remarks (whether intentionally or by misunderstanding). The author's own words, which we may assume Eusebius has carefully preserved with substantial accuracy, sometimes suffice to prevent our being misled. (See further below pp. 61-62 and 92-93).

---

[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 3-16.

[22] Henry, *Eusèbe et Plotin*, pp. 64-66.

[23] Cf. Beare, "Books and Publication," p. 161.

V

Since almost all we know of Philo's *Phoenician History* comes from Eusebius, it seems useful, before beginning the more detailed discussion of the fragments, to consider briefly the general character and structure of the material. Eusebius' discussion of Philo can be divided into eight sections:

1. Porphyry on Sanchuniathon (803: 19-804: 11).
2. Excerpts from the introduction or preface of Philo's *Phoenician History* in which Philo discusses Sanchuniathon (804: 12-806: 9; 807: 10-19).
3. The Cosmogony (806: 11-807: 7).
4. The discovery of the essentials of civilization (807: 10-809: 14).
5. The Life of Kronos (809: 14-811:24).
6. Division of the World and Philo's conclusion (811: 24-813: 22).
7. Child sacrifice (813: 26-814: 17).
8. Snakes (814: 18-816: 12).[24]

These excerpts from Philo all seem to come from the first book of the *Phoenician History* and have thus been assigned by Jacoby. We should note, however, that part of the section on child sacrifice is cited twice by Eusebius, once as coming from Philo's Περὶ Ἰουδαίων (*P.E.* 1, 10, 42) and once as coming from the first book of the *Phoenician History* (*P.E.* 4, 16, 11 = 814: 3-17). In addition, Eusebius says that the section on snakes comes from Sanchuniathon's work *On the Phoenician Elements* which supposedly was also translated by Philo (814: 18-19).[25]

Philo, as we shall see, is an ardent Euhemerist, and all his gods were either mortals deified for their contributions to humanity, or forces of nature. It is on account of the Euhemerism that one can speak of gods as having nationality. Many of the gods have both Phoenician and Greek names, such as Kronos = El (809: 22) or

---

[24] Cf. a similar list in Williams, pp. 4-6.

[25] The relationship between the Περὶ Ἰουδαίων and the *Phoenician History* will be discussed in detail below, Chapter Ten, pp. 249-250. The work on the *Phoenician Elements* will be treated in the same chapter, pp. 252-254.

Chousor = Hephaistos (808: 22-23). Others are identified by Greek or Phoenician name only, such as Apollo (811: 7), Athena (810: 5), Atlas (809: 23), or Baitylos (809: 23).

Eusebius has excerpted Philo, and the fact that we are dealing with excerpts is probably responsible for many of the difficulties of interpretation we will encounter. There are rarely more than two sentences devoted to any character and the subjects change rapidly. The transitions seem abrupt and unclear, the flow of the narrative far from smooth. This leaves the impression that much has been skipped between the sections Eusebius cites. It is therefore often difficult and dangerous to argue from context or silence.

There are, however, important differences in the literary character and outlook of the various selections. The cosmogony is written in poetic parallelism, the same technique in which Ugaritic and Biblical poetry were written, while the other sections show no trace of this technique. The account of the discovery of the essentials of civilisation is thorougly Euhemeristic, with Philo taking pains to remind his reader that the characters involved were mortal humans divinised for their contributions to civilization. The life of Kronos begins with a mortal —τις Ἑλιοῦν (809: 14)—but once mentions θεὸς Οὐρανὸς (810: 28). In the section on the division of the world, the characters are almost constantly identified as *gods*: βασιλεὺς θεῶν (811: 25), θεὸς Τάαυτος (812: 15), συνόντων θεῶν (812: 16), τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς θεοῖς (812: 24), θεῷ Τααύτῳ (812: 29), and θεὸς Τάαυτος (813: 3). These differences require explanation.[26]

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER THREE

An attempt at a complete consideration of Philo's *Phoenician History* cannot overlook Wagenfeld's famous work.[27] Wagenfeld claimed to have discovered a full manuscript of Philo's book. The most complete analysis and critique of Wagenfeld was written by Muller,[28] who, among other objections, noted that Wagenfeld's text agrees exactly with Eusebius' quotations so far they went, save that when Eusebius states that he has omitted material, Wagenfeld supplies the omissions. Furthermore, Wagenfeld's text contains readings which are obvious typographical errors found in Orelli's edition of the Philonic fragments.

---

[26] These apparent differences between the various sections are discussed more fully in the relevant chapters. The apparent lack of Euhemerism in the "Life of Kronos" section was noticed by Du Mesnil Du Buisson, *NE*, pp. 72-73. He attempts to resolve the apparent contradiction by proposing that this section of the text comes from Porphyry. See further Du Mesnil Du Buisson, *NE*, pp. 77-87. The argument developed there is beyond rational evaluation.

[27] Wagenfeld, *Sanchuniathon*.

---

[28] Muller, "Wagenfeld," pp. 507-517.

CHAPTER FOUR

PORPHYRY'S ACCOUNT OF SANCHUNIATHON

i

Translation of Texts Discussed

(Eusebius)

(803: 19) Sanchuniathon narrates these things. He was a most ancient man and, as they say, lived before the time of the Trojan War. He is declared to have been approved[1] because of the accuracy and veracity of his *Phoenician History*. (803: 22) Philo (of Byblos, not the Hebrew) published Sanchuniathon's entire work, translating it from the Phoenician language into Greek.

(803: 24) In our own times, the author of the intrigue against us mentions these things in the fourth book of his study directed against us, testifying thus, word for word, about the man.[2]

(Porphyry)

(803: 26) Sanchuniathon of Beirut gives the truest account concerning the Jews, since it agrees best with their places and their names. (803: 28) For he took the treatises written by Hierombalos, the priest of the god Ieuo, who dedicated his work to Abibalos, the king of Beirut. (804: 2) [Hierombalos' work was] accepted as correct by Abibalos and by those who investigated the truth in his time (804: 3) The times of these people fall before that of the Trojan War and, roughly speaking, approach those of Moses, as the succession of Phoenician kings reveals. (804: 6) Moreover, Sanchuniathon (who, with a love of truth, collected and wrote up in the Phoenician language, the complete ancient history from the records in each city and from the texts in the temples), lived around the time of Semiramis, Queen of the Assyrians, who was recorded to have lived either before the Trojan War or at that very time. (804: 11) Philo of Byblos translated Sanchuniathon's work into the Greek language.

---

[1] I take ἀποδεχθῆναι as the aorist passive infinitive of ἀποδέχομαι, following Gifford, *Eusebius*, Vol. 1, p. 35. Cf. Müller, *FHG*, Vol. 3, p. 563.

[2] Cf. Williams, p. 69.

ii

803: 19 Sanchuniathon.

There is no longer any doubt that the name which Eusebius wrote as Σαγχουνιάθων[3] or Σαγχωνιάθων[4] is a transliteration of the well-known Phoenician name סכניתן. This name has been found in an inscription of the third century B.C. at Hadrumetus,[5] and in the variant form שכניתן.[6] The pattern of transliteration of Hebrew names in the Septuagint confirms Eusebius' transliteration.[7] By analogy with other Phoenician names such as עבדיתן,[8] and בעליתן,[9] Sanchuniathon must mean the god *Skn* gave,[10] and must be a personal name.[11]

Although the role and function of the Phoenician god *Skn* are not directly relevant to understanding the passage from Eusebius, a few comments seem appropriate. A scholarly consensus, which has three parts, has been reached concerning *Skn*:[12] (1) in its fullest form, the god's name should be written **Sakkun*, with a double *k* and with *u* as the final vowel; (2) **Sakkun* was the "administrator" or "superintendant" god; (3) **Sakkun* was identified with Greek Hermes. Each of these conclusions deserves scrunity.

---

[3] *P.E.* 1, 9, 19, and following.

[4] *P.E.* 10, 9, 11-16 = Jacoby's Eus^2 of the critical apparatus to l. 28. Theodoretus, *Gr. Aff. Cur.* 2, 44 also wrote Σαγχωνιάθων, but Theodoretus is not independent and is evidence only of what he read in Eusebius. See below, p. 46.

[5] *NE* 432b2.

[6] See Chabot, "Punica," p. 6.

[7] אכיש of I Kings 2: 39 becomes Αγχους in Greek, the כ rendered by Greek γχ. The Hebrew ת is usually transliterated by θ in the Septuagint: e.g., נביות of Gen. 28: 9 becomes Ναβαιώθ.

[8] CIS I, 112a.

[9] CIS I, 118.

[10] ιαθων is a perfect of the **qatōl* form. See Harris, *Grammar*, par. 13, p. 41. See further Μιλκιαθωνος in CIS I, 89.

[11] Cf. the older interpretations of Orelli, pp. x-xi, and Movers, p. 99. Movers in particular so doubted Sanchuniathon's humanity that he tried to interpret his name as the title of a book. The correct interpretation of the name was first proposed by Nöldeke, "Inscriptions," p. 1829.

[12] This consensus is well represented by the discussion of *Skn* in *KAI*, Vol. 3, p. 72. Cf. Benz, *Personal Names*, p. 365.

Virtually all scholars, including Albright, Barr, Cross, and Milik transliterate סכניתן as Sakkunyaton.[13] They argue that the γχ transliteration in Greek proves that the Semitic original had a double *k*. I would suggest that this conclusion is hazardous, since we know that Biblical אכיש was transliterated as Αγχους:[14] the γχ transliteration does not necessarily prove the presence of a double *k*. The conclusion that the final vowel was a *u* is equally uncertain; for while there is a Latin transliteration *Secchun*,[15] there is also a *Sachonis*.[16] Thus, the fullest vocalization of *Skn* could have been either **Sak(k)un* or **Sak(k)on*, and there is no evidence providing a definite basis for choice between these alternatives.

The second part of the scholarly consensus is more dubious. None of the inscriptions which mention *Skn* give any clue of his role in the pantheon.[17] The explanations of his name are therefore based on the assumption that it must be related to the noun *skn* known from

---

[13] Albright, *FSAC*, p. 318; Barr, "Philo of Byblos," p. 36; Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, p. 13; Milik, "Cultes," p. 558. See also Lipinski, "Skn et sgn," pp. 200-202 who bases his discussion of the vocalization of Sanchuniathon on conclusions concerning the reliability of Philo and Porphyry's accounts which will be proven unreliable, and on unfounded assumptions of dialectical differences in pronunciation.

[14] See above, n. 7.

[15] CIL VIII, 5099. See also the passage from Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 3, 126 discussed below. Athenaeus has written Sanchuniathon's name as Souniathon. While this is incorrect, it is nonetheless evidence for the *u* vocalization. Cf. Benz, *Personal Names*, pp. 298-299 & 365 who does not recognize the evidence for the **Sak(k)un* vocalization.

[16] CIL VIII, 698. Eusebius' two usages, Sanchuniathon and Sanchoniathon, noted above might seem to reflect the two alternative vocalizations of the divine name *Skn*; but this is unlikely, for neither Eusebius nor his assistants should have known differences in Phoenician pronunciation. Eusebius' alternate usages are therefore better explained as palaeographic variants in Greek: ου and ω being readily confused.

[17] The earliest mention of the god is in the personal name עבדסכן in CIS 1, 112a of 591 B.C. For a discussion of the date of this inscription see Peckham, *Development*, p. 127, n. 36. *Skn* was honored with an altar, commemorated by CIS 1, 118 (= *KAI* 58). *Skn* is also mentioned in the Punic inscription CIS, 1, 4851. Teixidor, "BES 1970," #80, pp. 373-374 has argued for restoring *Skn*'s name in *KAI* 258 and reading *ʾdr skn*. Finally, Milik, "Cultes," pp. 557-558 has suggested understanding סכות בנות of 2 Kings 17: 30 as *sk(n)t Bnt*, the attendant of the creator goddess Banit, now known from the Hermopolis papyri. It should be noted that Milik's proposal is based on his understanding of *Skn*'s name and function.

Amarna, Biblical Hebrew, and Phoenician inscriptions.[18] This noun means governor or viceroy, and the god *Skn* is accordingly explained as the "administrator" of the higher gods of the pantheon. This explanation is supposedly confirmed by appeal to the analogy of the god Paqid-Qos, the administrator of the Edomite national god Qos.[19]

The difficulty with this argument is that it is based almost solely on etymology, and the etymological foundation is weak. The noun *skn* is known from an Amarna gloss for *rābiṣu* as *sūkinu.*[20] This vocalization reflects the shift from *ā* in an earlier stratum of the language to *ō* (= *ū* in cuneiform).[21] In an earlier stratum the word must have been **sākinu.* In Hebrew and Phoenician the stressed long *a* becomes *o*: thus **sākinu* should become **sōkin(u)*, which is, in fact, behind Hebrew סֹכֵן. If the function of the god *Skn* is to be explained by the root *skn*, his name in Phoenician should also be vocalized *sōkin.* But the vocalizations which are attested are **Sak(k)un* and **Sak(k)on*, and these cannot be derived from *sōkin.*

The third element in the consensus is weakest of all. Cooke, following Schröder, suggested that *Skn* was the "Phoenician counterpart to Greek Hermes."[22] Schröder has two arguments for this conclusion. The first is the epithet of Hermes in the *Iliad* (20, 72) Σωκος, which he understood as a transliteration of *Skn.* The second is CIS 1,118 an inscription on an altar dedicated to *Skn.* Two other altars were found near this one, dedicated to Hermes and Zeus Soter. Schröder proposed that these three altars were connected and should be read as if they were a bilingual inscription.

Hermes' epithet is unlikely to be related to *Skn*; it is much more plausibly explained as derived from the Greek verb σωκέω, the derivation accepted by LSJ. As for the altars, they are connected only by their having been erected near each other. They were offered by different people, and they share no characteristics. Hirschfeld, the original publisher of all three inscriptions writes that the place where they were found must have been one at which sailors and travelers of many nations fulfilled obligations in accordance with the prescriptions of their native religions.[23] What these "obligations" were, and why a particular god was thanked, must have varied from case to case. Besides, what is one to do with Zeus Soter, and how is he related to *Skn* and Hermes? Finally, Philo's identifications of Greek equivalents of Phoenician deities seem uniformly correct; whenever there are bilingual inscriptions or other evidence referring to these gods the same Greek equivalents appear.[24] Yet Philo identifies Hermes with Taautos = Thoth and not with *Skn* (804: 28-29).[25]

---

[18] See EA 256, 9 where *sūkinu* glosses *rābiṣu.* There is also a *skn* in Gordon, *UT*, 146: 2 which may be derived from the same noun. In Biblical Hebrew see Isa. 22: 15. The Phoenician inscriptions are KAI 1, line 2 from Byblos and KAI 31 from Limassol in Cyprus. See also Masson-Szyncer, *Recherches*, pp. 69-76.

[19] Milik, "Cultes," p. 558, based on a suggestion of Cooke, *Textbook*, p. 100. See also Teixidor, "BES 1969," #56, p. 329, and "BES 1970," #80, pp. 373-374.

[20] See above, n. 18.

[21] See Harris, *Development*, pp. 43-44.

[22] See above, n. 19 and Du Mesnil du Buisson, *NE*, p. 70.

To summarize, we know very little if anything certain about the god *Skn*. Significant conclusions about the vocalization of his name, his function, or Greek equivalent must await further discoveries.

Returning to Sanchuniathon, the authority on Jewish History praised by Porphyry, we possess some information about him in addition to Eusebius' citations from Porphyry and Philo. Sanchuniathon is never mentioned before Philo of Byblos. After Philo he is first mentioned by Athenaeus, the pagan Greek rhetorician who flourished at the end of the second and at the beginning of the third centuries A.D. In *Deipnosophistai* 3, 126 Kynoulkos says to Oulpianos of Tyre:

> ἐμπίλασο, Οὐλπιανε, χθωροδλάψου πατρίου ὅς παρ᾽ οὐδενι τῶν παλαιῶν μὰ τὴν Δήμητρα γέγραπται πλῆν εἰ μὴ ἄρα παρὰ τοῖς τὰ φοινικικὰ συγγεγραφόσι, Σουνιάθωνι καὶ Μώχῳ τοῖς σοῖς πολίταις.
>
> Stuff yourself Oulpianos with the xthorodlapson (LSJ *s.v.* "said to be a Syrian food") of your fatherland which, by Demeter, has been written about by none of the ancients, except by those who wrote about Phoenician matters—by Souniathon (*sic*) and Mochos, your fellow citizens.

Sanchuniathon is a Tyrian according to Athenaeus.[26]

---

[23] Hirschfeld, "Attischen Kunstlerinschriften," p. 21.

[24] See the commentary to 809: 22-23 (Kronos-El); 811: 10-11 (Melqart-Herakles); 812: 3 (Astarte-Aphrodite); 812: 29-813: 3 (Eshmun-Aesclepius).

[25] To my knowledge, the only scholar to doubt the equation of *Skn* and Hermes is Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, pp. 50-51, n. 2. Eissfeldt does not explain why he doubts the identification.

[26] Athenaeus' mention of Sanchuniathon refutes Lobeck's theory that he was in-

Theodoretus' information about Sanchuniathon, *Gr. Aff. Cur.* 2, 44ff. seems based entirely on Eusebius (803: 24-804: 12). Theodoretus knows nothing not found in Eusebius and his quotations from Philo agree almost literally with Eusebius'. Theodoretus is therefore not an independent source.

The next mention of Sanchuniathon is in Suidas, *Lexicon s.v.* Sanchuniathon:

> Τύριος φιλόσοφος. ὅς γέγονε κατὰ τὰ Τρωικά. Περὶ τῆς Ἑρμοῦ φυσιολογίας ἥτις μετεφράσθη, Πάτρια Τυρίων τῇ φοινίκων διαλέκτῳ, Αἰγυπτιακὴν θεολογίαν καὶ ἄλλα τινά.
>
> A Tyrian philosopher. He flourished at the time of the Trojan War. [He wrote] *Concerning the Physical Doctrines of Hermes* (which was translated); *The Ancestral Traditions and Customs of the Tyrians*, in the Phoenician language; *Egyptian Theology*, and other works.

Gaisford, in his edition of Suidas, notes the following marginal entry:

> Σαγχουνιάθης, Ἀιδώνιος (Σιδώνιος?) τοῖς χρόνοις κατὰ Σεμίραμιν ἔγραψε τῇ φοινίκων διαλέκτῳ φυσιολογίαν καὶ ἄλλα τινά.
>
> Sanchuniathon, Aidonian (Sidonian?), during the time of Semiramis, wrote in the Phoenician language a work on physics and other works.[27]

The main entry may be partially dependent on Athenaeus or based on the same tradition as Athenaeus' remarks. It makes Sanchuniathon a Tyrian and the author of a book on Tyrian history, the book which

---

vented by Eusebius. See Lobeck, pp. 1265-1279. Lobeck's theory, incidentally, is testimony to the effectiveness of Philo in Eusebius' propaganda.

Mras, "Sanchuniathon," p. 176, n. 3, in an attempt to reduce the contradictions concerning Sanchuniathon's city, argues that Sanchuniathon was not really a Tyrian, but from Beirut. He therefore proposes understanding σοῖς πολίταις in Athenaus as "*landsleute*." This proposal cannot be accepted, for (1) it goes against the ordinary meaning of the words, and (2) the notice on Sanchuniathon in Suidas (which may be independent of Athenaeus) also makes Sanchuniathon a Tyrian. The contradictions concerning Sanchuniathon's city therefore remain.

[27] Gaisford, *Suidae Lexicon*, Vol. 2, p. 3241. Cf. Williams, pp. 131-132. If the marginal entry established that Sanchuniathon was definitely considered a Sidonian, the confusion of Tyre and Sidon for his city might be a criterion for dating Sanchuniathon. One might then date him to a time when Tyre and Sidon were united, and hence could be confused. Unfortunately, Sidonian is uncertain. Furthermore, what is one to do with the sources which make Sanchuniathon a Beirutian?

may have prompted Kynoulkos' remarks at the end of the citation from Athenaeus. But this is very slight evidence. The other books attributed to Sanchuniathon in the main entry are not known, although *The Physical Doctrines of Hermes*, which was translated, may refer to Philo (See 804: 24-29).

The sources of the marginal entry cannot be precisely determined. Two of the three pieces of information it contains support the conclusion that its sources are the material preserved by Eusebius. In agreement with the quotation from Porphyry, (804: 10), Sanchuniathon is made a contemporary of Semiramis. The authorship of a work on physics in the Phoenician language is ascribed to Sanchuniathon. This could easily be a description of the material which Philo claimed to be translating from Sanchuniathon's Phoenician book, which contains a cosmogony (see below, Chapter Six). However, the fact that Porphyry considers Sanchuniathon a native of Beirut while the marginal entry makes him Aidonian, (whatever that may mean, perhaps Sidonian) argues that the source of the marginal entry is not Eusebius.

The final mention of Sanchuniathon is in a fifteenth century MS. found in the library of Madrid.

> Σαγχουνιάθων ὁ Βηρύττιος τὴν φοινίκων θεολογίαν ἐξέδωκεν ἣν 'Ορφεὺς μετήνεγκε εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνὴν καὶ τελετὰς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων.
>
> Sanchuniathon of Beirut published the *Phoenician Theology* which Orpheus translated into Greek. [He] also [published a work on] the mysteries of the Egyptians.[28]

More interesting than the agreement of this text with Porphyry on Sanchuniathon's city is the attribution of the translation of the *Phoenician Theology* to Orpheus. Perhaps the author of these sentences noticed the parallels between the Orphic cosmogonies and the cosmogony which Philo claimed to be translating from Sanchuniathon (See Chapter Six, p. 123), and believing Philo's repeated claims (e.g. 813: 4-22) that the Greeks took their theological and religious notions from the Phoenicians, explained the similarities by assuming that Orpheus translated Sanchuniathon.[29]

---

[28] Iriarte, p. 346.

The four testimonies show that a fairly wide variety of works was attributed to Sanchuniathon in antiquity. Tyrian customs and history, physics, Egyptian theology and the Egyptian mysteries, all these were supposedly discussed by him. Sanchuniathon was also supposedly a native of two, if not three, major Phoenician cities: Tyre, Beirut, and perhaps Sidon.[30] Since these testimonies are independent of each other, and sometimes of Porphyry and Philo, this suggests that many traditions about Sanchuniathon were known in antiquity.

One point on which these differing traditions seem to agree is Sanchuniathon's date. Porphyry, as we shall see below, made Sanchuniathon a contemporary of Semiramis and of the Trojan War (804: 9-10). The main entry in Suidas agrees with the latter, the marginal with the former. The significance of these dates around the Trojan War will be discussed more fully below in the commentary on 804: 1, where it will be proven that these dates are unreliable and suspicious. Modern scholars have therefore not hesitated to propose dates of their own for Sanchuniathon. The most interesting of these proposals are those of Albright and Eissfeldt. Albright, in an article published in 1938 wrote that "the name Sanchuniathon would have been impossible before the early first millennium."[31] Characteristically, Albright does not state the reasons for his conclusion. Eissfeldt[32] already opposed Albright and noted that Albright was arguing from silence, and ignoring names such as Biblical יהונתן.[33] I should add that we have definite proof that theophoric names were compounded with *ytn* during the second millennium B.C. Posener has published a Middle Kingdom execration text in which a certain *Ytnhddw*, prince of Bet Hadar is mentioned.[34] *Ytnhddw* can mean nothing other than "Hadad gave," and differs from Sanchuniathon only in the name of the god and the position of the verb.

---

[29] Dornseiff, "Altorientalisches in Hesiod," pp. 238-239 almost takes this notice as serious historical fact.

[30] Du Mesnil du Buisson, *NE*, p. 71 attempts to resolve this contradiction by the suggestion that although Sanchuniathon was from Beirut he was interested in Tyrian matters, as is evidenced by his book Πάτρια Τυρίων. This interest in Tyre is explained by the fact that Tyre was a center of Hermetic studies and Sanchuniathon searched out the works of Taautos-Thoth-Hermes (804: 22ff.). Du Mesnil Du Buisson's proposal, however, is based on his highly idiosyncratic view of Philo. Cf. above nn. 26 & 27.

[31] Albright, "Recent Progress," p. 24. Albright's conclusions are accepted by Barr "Philo of Byblos," p. 36.

[32] Eissfeldt, *RS*, pp. 70-71, n. 4.

[33] יהונתן is formally different from Sanchuniathon in that it is formed on the root *ntn* as opposed to *ytn*.

More recently, Albright has suggested that "Sanchuniathon was a refugee from Tyre who settled in Berytus about the second quarter of the sixth century B.C."[35] Again, Albright does not state his evidence and it is not clear why he chose to make Sanchuniathon a Tyrian refugee at Beirut rather than the opposite. Albright's arguments for the sixth century date are based on "style and place in the history of thinking."[36] In other words, Albright has dated Sanchuniathon to agree with the date he assigns to the traditions ascribed to Sanchuniathon. If one disagrees with Albright's date of the traditions, as I do (see especially Chapter Six, pp. 101-103), his date needs other support.

While Eissfeldt has not suggested a precise date for Sanchuniathon, he has collected evidence which he believes makes it difficult to date him "later than the seventh century B.C."[37] Eissfeldt builds his arguments on the fact that Porphyry says that Sanchuniathon's *Phoenician History* was full of the names of those who sacrificed their children in times of great danger: πλήρης ... τῶν θυσάντων (813: 28-814: 1). Curtius Rufus, in describing the siege of Tyre by Alexander the Great mentions that some Tyrians proposed reviving the practice of child sacrifice, a practice which had long been discontinued by the time of Alexander (IV, III, 15, 23). Eissfeldt accepts Curtius Rufus' testimony and concludes that Sanchuniathon must have lived sometime before 323 B.C., when child sacrifice was still performed, for his book to be full of the names of the sacrificers.[38] Eissfeldt dates the discontinuation of official child sacrifice in Phoenicia to the seventh century B.C., the same time, he thinks, as the Book of Deuteronomy ended child sacrifice in Israel (Deut. 18: 9f.). Sanchuniathon must therefore have lived before the seventh century B.C.

---

[34] Posener, *Princes et Pays*, pp. 66-67.

[35] Albright, *YGC*, p. 195; *Id.*, "Neglected Factors," p. 240 is equally unconvincing. Miller, "El," p. 414 follows Albright. Cf. other attempts to resolve the contradiction, above, nn. 26, 27, & 30.

[36] Albright, private communication of March 22, 1971.

[37] Eissfeldt, *RS*, p. 69.

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 70.

Eissfeldt's conclusion is open to grave doubt since child sacrifice continued in Judea after Deuteronomy (Isa. 57: 5) and (in spite of Curtius Rufus) seems to have continued among Phoenician colonists in Africa down to Roman times. Tertullian, in a famous passage of the *Apologeticus* (9, 2) reports the following:

> *Infantes penes Africam Saturno immolabantur palam usque ad proconsulem Tiberii, qui eosdem sacerdotes in eisdem arboribus templi sui obumbractricibus scelerum votivis crucibus exposuit, teste militia patriae nostrae, quae id ipsum munus illi proconsuli functa est.*
>
> In Africa infants used to be sacrificed to Saturn, and quite openly, down to the proconsulate of Tiberius, who took those same priests and on the trees of his (Saturn's) temple—the same trees that had overshadowed their crimes—set them up, like votive offerings, on crosses; and the soldiers of my own country are witnesses to it, who served that proconsul in that very task.[39]

Thus although Eissfeldt is probably correct that Sanchuniathon lived at a time when child sacrifice was current (unless he was being deliberately archaistic, a supposition not unlikely) yet this time might include the Roman period, until a generation before Tertullian.[40]

In conclusion, Sanchuniathon seems to have been an authority on Phoenician religion and antiquities about whose date, place of origin, and works many different traditions were current. We thus have very little data concerning him. It is therefore most prudent to conclude, with Barr, that "Sanchuniathon ... was perhaps a figure like Moses of the Old Testament, to whom all sorts of ancient tradition was ascribed but of whom in those late times comparatively little in detail was known with assurance."[41]

---

[39] This passage contains numerous difficulties, for a discussion of which see Barnes, *Tertullian*, pp. 13-21. The argument for the dating of Sanchuniathon constructed on Tertullian does not depend on the resolution of these difficulties: Tertullian definitely testifies to the continuation of child sacrifice down to the times of the Roman Empire.

[40] Albright, *YGC*, pp. 232-235 also concedes that child sacrifice continued until the second century A.D. Admittedly, it is dubious whether or not the practice continued so long in Phoenicia as in Africa. Colonial areas are often more conservative than the metropolis. For a further discussion of the details of child sacrifice see below, pp. 247-252.

There are, however, even at this stage of the discussion, grounds for suspicion. Bickerman has argued that religious works of the ancient Near East rarely had named authors.[42] Omitting the name of the human author made the work seem eternally true, and its contents not bound to a person, place, or time. When the people of the Near East met Greeks, however, they began to copy Greek practice and the name of the author became important. Thus the Pentateuch never explicitly states that it was written by or through the agency of Moses. Rather, it is an impersonal account of history and a record of laws revealed to Moses. Philo Judaeus was apparently the first to claim that Moses *wrote* the sacred books under divine guidance (συνέγραψεν ὑφηγησαμένου θεοῦ).[43] If Bickerman is correct, the fact that Sanchuniathon is a *named author* for both Porphyry and Philo (see below 804: 22) may be grounds for suspecting that the sources of their descriptions of Sanchuniathon were written in the Hellenistic period.

803 : 19-20 ἀνὴρ - πρεσβύτερος

In introducing the quotation from Porphyry, Eusebius prepares the reader for the quotation by paraphrasing it. Since Sanchuniathon was a contemporary of Semiramis, and since she lived either before or at the time of the Trojan War (804: 9-10), Eusebius states that Sanchuniathon is reputed to have lived before the time of the Trojan War. The date attributed to Sanchuniathon is based on the quotation from Porphyry.[44] The date will therefore be discussed below, in the comments on Porphyry, but it should be remembered that Eusebius wanted his evidence to be as old as possible (see also the Appendix to this chapter).

803: 23 οὐχ ὁ Ἑβραῖος

Since Philo Judaeus was better known, Eusebius considers it necessary to remind the reader that the Philo he will cite is not the Jewish one.[45]

---

[41] Barr, "Philo of Byblos," p. 37.

[42] Bickerman, "Faux Littéraires," pp. 32-37.

[43] *V. Mosis*, 2, 11.

[44] Cf. Williams, pp. 3, 26, 34, 48.

[45] Williams, p. 133, inexplicably makes the two Philo's cousins.

803: 23 μεταβαλὼν

Philo's claim to have translated Sanchuniathon is mentioned several times, e.g., 804: 11-12, 804: 19-21; 806: 11-14; 813: 23-24; 813: 28-814: 3; 814: 18-19. This claim is, of course, the basis for one of the main problems in the scholarly discussion of the fragments.[46] The whole tenor of the fragments, it should be noted, is inexplicable unless Philo claimed to be translating. Philo is later to argue that all other treatments of his problem are incorrect because they were based on inaccurate and false sources, while he has the truth because he used the true sources (804: 19-806: 10). This true and accurate source is Sanchuniathon whose methods and goals Philo describes in detail. All this would be meaningless if Philo did not also claim that he was faithfully rendering what could supposedly be read in Sanchuniathon. It may solve some of the problems scholars find in the fragments to see Philo more as adaptor than as translator,[47] but this is not what Philo intended.[48]

803: 24 μέμνηται - συσκευὴν

The reference is to Porphyry's polemic *Against the Christians.*[49]

803: 26 Ἰουδαίων

Eissfeldt feels that information about the Jews is out of place, since Eusebius has praised the accuracy and reliability of Sanchuniathon's works on the Phoenicians. Furthermore, whether Sanchuniathon or Hierombalos is the subject of 804: 1-3, this information comes, ultimately, from a work dedicated to the king of Beirut and approved by Phoenician scholars. Eissfeldt therefore suggests emending Ἰουδαίων to Ἰεουδαίων. The son Kronos sacrificed was called Ieoud and the Phoenicians still use that name for an only child (814: 13). According to Eissfeldt, Porphyry states that Sanchuniathon has the truest information concerning the names of the children who were sacrificed and the places where they were sacrificed. Eissfeldt assumes that Porphyry was interested in child sacrifice among the Phoenicians since he was discussing the biblical sacrifices of Isaac and Jephtah's daughter.[50]

---

[46] See Chapter One, pp. 1-7.

[47] Thus Eissfeldt, *RS*, p. 9; *S. Von B.*, pp. 61-63; *T. und S.*, pp. 48-50. Eissfeldt has been followed by Clemen, p. 15 and Dornseiff, "Altorientalisches in Hesiod," p. 239, n. 1. See also Chapter One, p. 4, n. 14.

[48] See below, Chapter Five, pp. 82-83.

[49] Cf. Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 797, n. 1. On a possible further use of Philo by Porphyry see Schaublin, "Diodor von Tarsus," pp. 58-63, and below on 812: 7-9.

This emendation is unlikely. First, the context in Porphyry is one of places and names: Ἰουδαίων fits that context much better than Ἰεουδαίων.[51] Next, Porphyry did discuss Palestinian geography in his polemic against the Christians. Commenting on the size of the Sea of Galilee he quotes "those who narrate the truth about places say that it is not a sea but a small lake."[52] Finally, as Barr has noted, if a Greek book had been entitled *Concerning the* Ἰεουδαίων the title would have been virtually completely unintelligible.[53] For all these reasons Ἰουδαίων should be retained.

Although Eissfeldt's emendation is unlikely, the problems in the passage which prompted him to propose the emendation deserve further discussion. Eissfeldt is correct to remark that information about the Jews which comes, ultimately, from a work dedicated to the king of Beirut in the second millennium B.C. is implausible. Even if one can appeal to the long history of relations between Phoenicia and Israel, stretching back to the days of Solomon and Hiram of Tyre, this appeal hardly inspires confidence in the accuracy of Porphyry's statements. The most likely explanation of Porphyry's account of Sanchuniathon, Hierombalos priest of YHWH, and Abibalos king of Beirut, as will become clearer below, is to consider the entire account sheer fantasy.

A second difficulty Eissfeldt noted is that Eusebius praises Sanchuniathon's reliability on Phoenician matters, but then quotes Porphyry's approval of Sanchuniathon on the Jews. An appreciation of Eusebius' purposes in quoting Porphyry can remove this difficulty. Eusebius quotes Porphyry on Sanchuniathon for two reasons. First he can thus free himself of the suspicion of having invented his source and establish its reliability by showing that the great defender of paganism, Porphyry, believed Sanchuniathon trustworthy.[54] In addition, as Movers first noticed, Eusebius can thus embarrass Porphyry with the opinions of the same author whom Porphyry believed reliable.[55] For both these reasons Eusebius is happy to be able to quote Porphyry's approval of Sanchuniathon's works, although the quoted passage would show to an attentive reader that Porphyry had praised Sanchuniathon's accuracy about the Jews, not about the Phoenicians.

---

[50] Eissfeldt, *S. von B.*, pp. 26-35. Troiani, p. 70, n. 208 mentions Eissfeldt's proposal, but does not provide a critical evaluation.

[51] Cf. Eissfeldt, "Text. Bemerk.," p. 97.

[52] Porphyry, *Against the Christians*, frag. 55 (Harnack).

[53] Barr, "Philo of Byblos," p. 32, n. 1.

804: 1 Hierombalos

Although there are other possibilities, such as חרמבעל, this name is probably a transliteration of ירמבעל as suggested by Albright.[56] This name is attested in Latin transcription as Ierombal;[57] the names בעלרם and רמבעל (which differ either only in the tense, or in the tense and position of the verb) are attested in Phoenician inscriptions.[58] The name Hierombalos would thus be an exact equivalent of Biblical Jeremiah.

804: 1 Ἰευώ

Orelli thought that *Ieuō*,[59] must be YHWH the God of Israel, but he was troubled by the name of the priest Hierombalos, compounded with Baal. He therefore suggested that Hierombalos must have been the priest of some pagan god whose name has fallen out of the text and been replaced by Ieuō = Iaō = YHWH.[60] The difficulty sensed by Orelli is even clearer if one puts the problem as follows: whatever the name of the priest and wherever he lived (we are never told explicitly where Hierombalos lived), how can one imagine a priest of YHWH writing for the king of Beirut at the time of the Trojan War?

---

[54] This point has been seen by many others, including Williams, p. 137, and Loewenstamm, "Philon," p. 315.

[55] Movers, pp. 117-118.

[56] Albright, *FSAC*, pp. 317-318, n. 57. Eissfeldt's proposed equation of Sourmoubelos (818: 12) and Hierombalos seems unnecessary. See Eissfeldt, *S. von B.*, pp. 19-21.

[57] CIL 13, 7041.

[58] רמבעל CIS I, 99 from Abydos in the fifth or sixth century; בעלרם King of Idalion, father of Milkyathon, CIS I, 90. At one time, before the discovery of these inscriptions, it was tempting to follow Bochart and identify Gideon who was also called ירובעל (Jud. 7: 1) with Hierombalos. Bochart, p. 770. There are obvious chronological difficulties in placing Hierombalos-Gideon both before the Trojan War and at the time of the Judges, as Orelli, p. 3, n. 3, already saw. Even more serious is the fact that ירובעל (meaning "Baal has substituted," according to Held; cf. Noth, *IPN*, p. 206) and ירמבעל are not equatable. Finally, could Gideon have written *hypomnemata* which have left no trace in Israelite tradition but were known to Sanchuniathon? In spite of all these difficulties, Bochart's suggestion was revived by Meyer, *GdA*, Vol. II, 2, p. 177, n. 3.

[59] Theodoretus normalized *Ieuō* to *Iaō*, the usual transliteration in the LXX for YHWH.

Several answers can be offered to this question. There may be evidence of worship of YHWH by non-Israelite Semites.[61] If Hierombalos were priest of such a group he could have served Ieuō-YHWH. Furthermore, if this group did not worship YHWH exclusively,[62] Hierombalos' name would pose no problem. Another related possibility is to point to the enigmatic *Yw*[63] of the Ugaritic texts. *Ieuō* in Philo would equal Ugaritic *Yw*,[64] which may or may not be related to YHWH. Unfortunately, the reading *Yw* is uncertain, and even if certain, it is not clear that *Yw* is a divine name.[65]

Another solution is Eissfeldt's. He proposes that *Ieuō* is an error for Yam—the equivalent of Poseidon and the god of Beirut, Abibalos' city. If Hierombalos served Yam, his name would not be troublesome. In addition, the entire passage becomes clear and consistent. Hierombalos (probably of Beirut) served Yam = Poseidon, god of his patron's city. This work was used by Sanchuniathon of Beirut.[66]

A more attractive alternative is to retain the usual *Ieuo* = YHWH and to admit the implausibility of a priest of YHWH named Hierombalos who wrote for the king of Beirut in the thirteenth century B.C., but to explain Porphyry's account as sheer fantasy. Such a fiction might well appeal to the Hellenistic source(s) of much in Porphyry's description of Sanchuniathon, whose hand(s) we will detect throughout.

---

[60] Orelli, p. 4, n. 4.

[61] See Murtonen, *Philological Treatise*, pp. 43-54. Cf. Clemen, p. 9.

[62] Israelites certainly did not worship YHWH exclusively. See e.g., Jer. 7: 18 and 44: 15-19.

[63] Even the reading *Yw* is uncertain. See Cassuto, *Anat.*, p. 99.

[64] Troiani inclines to accept this explanation, pp. 72-74.

[65] See Ginsberg, "Anath and Aqhat," p. 21, n. 49. Cf. Oldenburg, *Conflict*, p. 126, n. 5, and Dussaud, "Yahwe," p. 237.

[66] Eissfeldt, *S. von B.*, pp. 33-35.

804 : 1 ὅς

Whose work was approved by Abibalos and the contemporary scholars? There are two arguments for understanding Sanchuniathon as the subject. First, it might seem that Eusebius understood Sanchuniathon as the subject of the clause since the clause states that its subject's work was approved and Eusebius, in introducing the citation from Porphyry, states that Sanchuniathon's work was approved (803: 21). Secondly, Eissfeldt argues that the ὅς clause is to be understood in the light of the colophon of *UT* 62. The colophon mentions the scribe, the chief priest who taught the scribe (*lmd*), and the king who gave the text to the library. Similarly Sanchuniathon mentions both the priest from whom he learned everything (Hierombalos) and his patron (Abibalos).[67] However, both Driver[68] and Ginsberg[69] translate *lmd* as dictated, that is, the colophon notes the chief priest who dictated the tablet. Eissfeldt's analogy is thus destroyed.[70]

The argument based on Eusebius' introduction to the quotation is strong. However, Eusebius' statement that Sanchuniathon's work was approved for its accuracy and reliability does not mean that Eusebius understood Sanchuniathon as the subject of the ὅς clause. Eusebius refers to Sanchuniathon's approval by Porphyry. Furthermore, there is strong internal evidence from the ὅς clause and the sentences that follow that Hierombalos is the subject of the ὅς clause. When Porphyry, in 804 : 3-4, specifies the time of τούτων, the people of the ὅς clause, it is before the Trojan War, as confirmed by the list of Phoenician kings. In 804: 9-11, Porphyry specifies Sanchuniathon's time as that of Semiramis, that is either before or during the Trojan War. It is clear that the time of the people of the ὅς clause is distinguished from that of Sanchuniathon. Accordingly, they must be Hierombalos and Abibalos. For if Sanchuniathon were included in the τούτων of 804: 3 and if his time were confirmed by the list of

---

[67] Eissfeldt, *S. von B.*, pp. 26-35. Walcot, *Hesiod*, p. 18 follows Eissfeldt, also Gese, *Religionen Altsyriens*, p. 31, n. 50.

[68] Driver, *CML*, p. 115.

[69] H.L. Ginsberg in *ANET*, p. 141.

[70] Destroyed with the analogy are arguments for Sanchuniathon's dates suggested by Eissfeldt on the basis of the analogy. Furthermore, even if Eissfeldt's analogy were correct there was no book dedication at Ugarit. See below, pp. 58-59. Cf. the inconclusive discussion in Troiani, p. 76.

Phoenician kings, there would be no need to introduce a new discussion of his date and a new reference point and proof for that date.[71]

That Hierombalos is the subject of the ὅς clause is confirmed by Eusebius' comment on our passage in P.E. 10,9.14,485c. Eusebius, there, also placed Abibalos and Hierombalos before Sanchuniathon and Semiramis. This must be the meaning of the text as it stands. The difficulty in perceiving the meaning, however, is a first indication that all is not smooth in Porphyry's account of Sanchuniathon. See below on 804: 8.

One final point requires comment. Whomever the dates apply to, they are all around the Trojan War. This is probably no accident and reflects the concern of barbarian historians of the Hellenistic period to prove their native sources were at least as old if not older than Homer.[72] The dates therefore argue that the description of Sanchuniathon, Hierombalos, and Abibalos was written during the Hellenistic period.

804: 1 Abibalos

We should reject the identification of this king with the other known Phoenician kings named Abibalos, the kings of Tyre,[73] Byblos,[74] and Arvad.[75] This Abibalos is king of Beirut.[76]

There should no longer be any doubt that the Greek transliteration Abibalos stands for the Phoenician name אבבעל, now attested in inscriptions and cuneiform transcription.[77]

---

[71] My discussion is independent of similar ones in Nautin, pp. 267-268, and in Troiani, p. 72.

[72] See Bickerman, "Origines Gentium," pp. 70-71.

[73] Josephus *C. Ap.* 1, 113 & 117.

[74] KAI 5.

[75] Asb. ii, 82. Cf. Williams pp. 34-35 who does not recognize that there were several Phoenician kings named Abibalos.

[76] Nautin, p. 272 suggests that making Abibalos *king of Beirut* is an indication of the Hellenistic origin of Porphyry's information (cf. my similar arguments on pp. 51, 55-59, 91-92). Nautin's suggestion is based on his contention that Beirut rarely had its own kings, and first flourished after the Seleucid period. The city became very important in the Roman era, particularly for its law school. Eissfeldt, *S. von B.*, pp. 40-41 replies quite aptly that the Amarna letters speak of Ammuniri of Beirut (e.g., EA, 137). I have therefore not adopted Nautin's suggestion.

[77] Jacoby, in the critical apparatus *ad loc.* mentions Nöldeke's emendation to Abedalos. The emendation is obviously unnecessary, in view of the evidence cited. Inexplicably, it is accepted by Clemen, p. 9.

Albright has attempted to use the names of Hierombalos and Abibalos as further arguments for his date of Sanchuniathon ca. 600 B.C.[78] He argues that such names were popular during the first half of the first millennium B.C. While Albright's statement about the history of names is probably correct, it is not conclusive—names also occur at times when they are not particularly popular—nor does it help much to date Sanchuniathon, who may have been separated by a considerable interval from the authors whose works he used.

804: 2 ἀναθεὶς

Walcot rendered this word "submitted,"[79] but this is a desperate attempt by Walcot to evade the difficulties for his theory inherent in the usual meaning of ἀνατίθημι in a context such as ours—to dedicate a book. It is highly unlikely that a book written before the Trojan War would contain a dedication. Renan already noted that ancient semitic works were not dedicated by their authors.[80] Among the Greeks the first book to be dedicated was written in the fifth century B.C. and the practice did not become widespread until the Hellenistic period.[81]

The problem could perhaps be avoided if this were a work of Wisdom literature. What Porphyry called "dedication" might then be a misunderstanding of the address by the author to his pupil. But this solution will not work, as Hierombalos and Abibalos are not master and pupil, but priest and king. Moreover, Hierombalos' work is not wisdom literature.

The problem is therefore inescapable. The story that Sanchuniathon's source, Hierombalos, dedicated his book to Abibalos is of Hellenistic origin. This confirms the suspicions noted above (pp. 51, 55 & 57) that some of Porphyry's information about Sanchuniathon is of Hellenistic origin, and that the description as it stands was written during the Hellenistic period.

---

[78] Albright, *FSAC*, p. 318, n. 57.

[79] Walcot, *Hesiod*, p. 18, similarly, Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, p. 28.

[80] Renan, p. 299. Even today when we know much more about the Ancient Near East than in Renan's time (1858), I know of no Ancient Near Eastern text prior to the Hellenistic period containing a dedication. Clemen, pp. 9-10 confuses the issue. He mentions both the supposed dedication and the approval by the scholars of the time (804: 2-3), then gives biblical evidence that texts were submitted to critical scrutiny (II Kings 22: 8ff.) and neglects to discuss the problem of dedication. Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, p. 67, n. 2 mentions but does not refute Renan's argument. Clapham, p. 2 renders ἀναθεὶς "dedicated," but does not comment on the word.

[81] See Denniston, "Dedications," p. 259.

804: 8 ὑπομνημάτων - ἀναγραφῶν

According to this line Sanchuniathon had two types of sources, the records[82] in each city and the collected temple texts—presumably dedicatory, ritual, and historical. Perhaps these temple texts recorded the history, both mythological and actual, of the temple, like the inscriptions of the Greek temple of Lindos where the visits of Kadmos, Minos, Herakles, Menelaus, and Helen are recorded.[83] A parallel to the city records might be the records of Antioch consulted by Malalas for information regarding events in that city during Trajan's Parthian compaigns.[84] These would be the sort of city records most familiar to Philo and Porphyry.

As the text stands, the following sources are attributed to Sanchuniathon in the quotation from Porphyry. Sanchuniathon derived his information about Jews—especially good for Jewish names and geography—from the work of Hierombalos, who lived almost at the time of Moses. The *de* in 804: 6 adds that Sanchuniathon (who lived at the time of Semiramis, that is either before or at the time of the Trojan War), also used the records found in each city and the collected temple texts in composing his history of antiquity as a whole.

Something is clearly amiss. The chronological information is not clearly presented, as we have seen, and the description of the sources is confused. The Sanchuniathon of 803: 26 wrote about the Jews and based his work on the treatises of Hierombalos. The Sanchuniathon of 804: 6, on the other hand (*de*), wrote about all of antiquity and based his work on the records of cities and the temple texts which he collected and wrote up.[85]

Two explanations of these difficulties are possible. One is that the text of 803 : 26 is corrupt and that Porphyry was referring to some other author with a different name (another author also named Sanchuniathon would have provoked comment). The name of the author interested in the Jews, who used Hierombalos, has dropped out and, unless one could find traces of a Beirutian scholar who wrote about the Jews before the Trojan War, is irrecoverable. Porphyry, when discussing the sources of his polemic, would have referred to Sanchuniathon and then mentioned this unknown Beirutian as most reliable on the Jews, and then come back to Sanchuniathon as the most reliable for the general history of the area. Either Eusebius or some copyist before him, by confusion, replaced the Beirutian's name with Sanchuniathon's.

---

[82] For the translation ἀναγραφαί = records, see LSJ *s.v.* II B 4.

[83] Blinkenberg, *Tempelchronik*, III, IV, V, X, XI.

[84] Malalas, *Chronikon*, p. 443 (Dindorf).

[85] This conclusion was stated, but not developed by Troiani, p. 70.

This explanation is rather tortuous, which encourages the search for a simpler alternative. We have seen that many works with a wide variety of interests were attributed to Sanchuniathon in antiquity. Tyrian customs and history, physics, Egyptian theology, and the Egyptian mysteries were all supposedly treated by him. Perhaps the contradictions in Porphyry can be better explained by the assumption that Porphyry has combined two or more conflicting traditions about Sanchuniathon. We will be in a better position to identify at least one of these traditions after having analyzed Philo's remarks on Sanchuniathon in the following chapter. For the moment, however, it should be remembered that Porphyry, as a Tyrian, might have known any number of traditions about this famous sage of Phoenician antiquity.

804: 9 Semiramis

Semiramis is introduced incidentally, as synchronistic with Sanchuniathon. She is, of course, the legendary founder of Babylon, according to the stories told by the Greeks. She has now been identified with an actual Assyrian queen, who was regent for her son at the end of the ninth century B.C.[86]

It would be interesting if one could determine whether Porphyry's Semiramis belongs with the legendary accounts of her told by the Greeks or with the more accurate Near Eastern versions.[87] If the former could be demonstrated we would have another case of

---

[86] Lenschau, "Semiramis," cols. 1204-1212. Cf. Gese, *Religionen Altsyriens*, p. 32.

[87] See Berossus, *FGrH* 680 F 8, 142 = Josephus *C. Ap.* 1,142.

Hellenistic concerns betrayed in Porphyry's account of Sanchuniathon. Unfortunately, Porphyry's description of Semiramis is insufficiently detailed to allow for certainty.

iii

Hellenistic concerns dominate Porphyry's account of Sanchuniathon. His account is therefore hard to accept as an accurate depiction of a man who supposedly lived before or at the time of the Trojan War.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER FOUR

In the quotation from Porphyry in Eusebius (804: 10), it is stated that Semiramis lived either before or during the Trojan War. It is also implied that she lived after Moses, since he lived before the Trojan War. In Jerome's translation of Eusebius' *Chronicon*, a different date for Semiramis is attributed to Porphyry:

> *Ex ethnicis vero ille impius Porphyrius in quarto operis sui libro ... post Moysen Semiramin fuisse adfirmat. Quae apud Assyrios CL ante Inachum regnavit annis. Itaque iuxta eum DCCC paene et L annis troiano bello Moyses senior invenitur.*
>
> Among the gentiles, forsooth, that impious Porphyry affirms, in the fourth book of his work ... that Semiramis lived after Moses. She ruled among the Assyrians 150 years before Inachus. Therefore, according to him (Porphyry), Moses is almost 850 years older than the Trojan War.[88]

This method of dating Moses is to make him slightly older than Semiramis whose date was known. She ruled 150 years before Inachus, and it had been previously stated in the *Chronicon*[89] that Inachus was 700 years before the Trojan War. (One must read 700 with Syncellus' Greek text and not 500 with Jerome's translation or else the arithmetic does not work.) Semiramis is thus dated almost 850 years before the Trojan War, which clearly contradicts Porphyry's statement in 804: 10, taken from the same book of the same work, that she lived either before or during the Trojan War.

---

[88] Schöne, *Eusebius*, p. 4.

[89] *Ibid.*

This seeming contradiction can be resolved by assuming that the calculation of Moses' date (and the consequent dating of Semiramis) in the *Chronicon* is not part of the quotation from Porphyry, but an addition by Eusebius—an attempt by him to estimate Moses' time, based on *Porphyry's* statement (that Moses preceded Semiramis) and *his own* (Eusebius') date for Semiramis. Thus the direct quotation from Porphyry may end with *adfirmat*. Furthermore, the last sentence speaks about the date according to *Porphyry* (*iuxta eum*). In a word, what Eusebius has done is to accept Porphyry's statement that Semiramis came after Moses, but instead of retaining Porphyry's date for Semiramis, Eusebius has substituted his own.

That this is the correct interpretation is confirmed by Eusebius' second citation of 803: 26-804: 10 (*basilidos*) in *P.E.* 10, 9, 485bff. There Eusebius argues much as in the passage from the *Chronicon*. However, it is significant that he does not quote the entire passage from Porphyry but omits the phrases in which Porphyry presents his date for Semiramis, for only thus could he insert his own, much earlier, date for Semiramis and thus attribute a much earlier date for Moses to Porphyry.

CHAPTER FIVE

PHILO'S ACCOUNT OF SANCHUNIATHON

i

Translation of Texts Discussed

(Eusebius)

(804: 12) So wrote the author mentioned above [Porphyry], bearing witness to both the veracity and antiquity of the theologian. (804: 13) But [Sanchuniathon] proclaims as divine not the god above all things, nor indeed the gods in heaven, but mortal men and women; nor are they of refined character, persons who would be worthy of approval for their virtue or of admiration for their love of wisdom; (804: 15) but they are involved in the evil of depravity and complete wickedness. (804: 16) And he testifies that these are the very same who are even yet believed to be gods by all, both in the cities and the countryside. (804: 18) But receive the proofs of these things from [his own] writings.

(804: 19) Philo, distributing Sanchuniathon's entire work in nine books, says in the introduction to the first book the following things about Sanchuniathon, in these very words.

(Philo)

(804: 22) These being the facts, Sanchuniathon being a very learned and very inquiring man, desiring to know, from all sources, everything from the beginning when things first took shape,[1] with great research tracked out the [writings] of Taautos (804: 25), [since] he knew that of those who were under the sun Taautos was the first to have conceived the discovery of the letters and to have begun the writing of records. (804: 26) He [therefore] laid, as it were, the foundation of his work on this [Taautos],[2] whom the Egyptians call Thouth, the Alexandrians Thoth, and the Greeks translate Hermes.

---

[1] Several different translations have been offered for these phrases: compare Bochart, p. 772, Gifford, *Eusebius*, p. 36 and Nautin, p. 261. I follow the latter two.

(Eusebius)

(805: 1) Having said these things, [Philo] blames the more recent writers, who [came] after these events, because they violently and untruthfully interpret the stories about the gods as allegories and accounts and expositions of physical processes. Accordingly, continuing, he says.

(Philo)

(805: 4) But the more recent writers on religion[3] have completely thrown out the events as they occurred from the beginning; and having invented allegories and myths, and [thus] having falsely related [the true stories] to cosmic events[4] (805: 7), they established mysteries[5] and introduced in them a lot of nonsense, so that one cannot readily perceive what truly occurred. (805: 8) But [Sanchuniathon] having had access to the hidden texts found in the *adyta* of the temples of Ammon, [texts] composed in letters which, indeed, were not known to everyone, himself worked out the interpretation of all these [texts]; (805: 11) and having completed the investigation, and having dismissed the allegories and the myth according to the elements, he accomplished his purpose. (805: 13) Until, once again, the priests who succeeded him in later times wished to conceal this[6] and return[7] to the mythical accounts, (805: 15) whence the secret, [allegorical interpretation] reared its head again, [at a time when] it had not yet reached the Greeks.

---

[2] Bernays *ap*. Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 800, n. 4 noticed the basic difficulty in these lines: both participles, εἰδὼς and βαλόμενος, depend on ἐξεμάστευσεν, but one participle must be causal and the other consequential, which is possible but a bit awkward.

[3] Williams, p. 74, renders ἱερολόγων as "authors of holy legends."

[4] Williams, p. 75, renders "earthly feelings."

[5] As several scholars have noted, the passage in 805 is to be compared with 813: 4-22 and 818: 9-15. The general charges laid against allegorizers, physiologizers, and mystery makers in our passage are made against specific priests in the other two. See Gruppe, pp. 371-373, and Williams, pp. 146f.

[6] The antecedent of αὐτὴν is πραγματείᾳ of 805: 11.

[7] The problem is the meaning of ἀποκαταστῆσαι. The form is the first aorist infinitive of ἀποκαθίστημι, however the first aorist is usually causal and, as Bernays *ap*. Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 802, n. 7 notes, the causal sense is difficult. If the verb were causal and transitive, the object of the infinitive would seem to be αὐτὴν of 805: 14. Yet one cannot say that the priests wanted to restore Sanchuniathon's work into the

(Eusebius)

(805: 16) After these things he says:

(Philo)

(805: 16) We [*sc.* I] have found out these things because we desired to know Phoenician history precisely and examined much material —and not that [preserved] by the Greeks. For the latter is self-contradictory and was composed by some people more [concerned] for polemics than for truth.

(Eusebius)

(805: 20) And after other remarks [he says]:

(Philo)

(805: 20) And thus it came about that we, having seen the disagreement among the Greeks, were convinced that things were as he had written. (805: 22) Concerning this subject I have sedulously written[8] three books, bearing the title, *The Unconventional History.*

---

legendary accounts. Bernays proposes reading ἀποκαταστῆναι, the intransitive second aorist infinitive of the same verb. He translates: "The priests wanted to hide Sanchuniathon's work and return (to believing) the incorrect accounts." The emendation is unnecessary, however, as the sense Bernays properly felt was required can be obtained without emendation. Transitive and intransitive verbs were often confused in Hellenistic Greek and transitive verbs were used in an intransitive sense. On this point see Moulten and Turner, *NT Greek*, Vol. 3, pp. 51-53.

[8] There are two possibilities for translating πεφιλοτίμηται. The Greek verb means primarily to be earnest or zealous, and thence to do something earnestly, zealously or contentiously. The object of the zeal is, if an action, normally an infinitive; if a person or thing, normally in a prepositional phrase. The verb can also take a person or thing as a direct object, not only a cognate accusative as in Josephus *BJ* 1,206, but also ordinary accusatives, as in Demosthenes 1046 (*Pros Phainippon* 24), Philo, *De Abr.* 242. If our passage, as suggested by Smith, is an example of this usage, Philo would state that he has sedulously or contentiously written three books on the topic. Cf. Orelli, p. 7. An alternative explanation was suggested by Bickerman. The verb means not only to seek honor but also to contend for honor, or more generally, to contend. Philo would thus state "concerning this subject my three books ... contend (or polemicize)".

(Eusebius)

(805: 23) And again after other remarks he adds:

(Philo)

(805: 24) It is necessary for the sake of clarity below and for the determination of particulars, to state explicitly that (805: 25) the most ancient of the barbarians, especially the Phoenicians and the Egyptians, from whom the remainder [of mankind] received [their ideas], considered as the greatest gods those who discovered things useful for life or who, in some way, benefited the peoples. (806: 1) Considering them as benefactors and as the causes of many good things, [these ancients] worshipped them as divinities and, when they had gone to [their] fate, erected temples and consecrated *stelai* and pillars in their names (806: 4) and moreover, revering them greatly, the Phoenicians also established very great festivals in their honor. (806: 5) And particularly from their own kings, they gave names to the elements of the cosmos and to some of the accepted gods. (806: 7) The only physical gods they recognized were the sun and the moon and the other planets and the elements and the things connected with these. (806: 9) In this way they had some mortal and some immortal divinities.

ii

Commentary

The passage cited contains Eusebius' introductory remarks to quotations from the introduction written by Philo for his *Phoenician History*, followed by the quotations themselves.

804: 12-13 ταῦτα-μαρτυρήσας

Eusebius states explicitly his purpose in quoting Porphyry. He wants to establish that Porphyry believed that Sanchuniathon was ancient and reliable. See above, Chapter Four, pp. 53-54.

804: 19 εἰς ἐννέα βίβλους

This disagrees with Porphyry's statement in 803: 3-5 that Philo's work consisted of eight books of translation. Baudissin solves this contradiction by assuming that the entire work consisted of nine books. The first book contained Philo's introduction and some translation, while the other eight books consisted of translation only. Eusebius counts nine books of translation, while Porphyry, mistakenly, only counted eight (since he considered the entire first book an introduction).[9] Another possible solution is that there were two or more editions of Philo's work in which the division of books differed.[10]

804: 19 πᾶσαν

We have seen in the previous chapter that a fairly large number and variety of works were attributed to Sanchuniathon in antiquity. It is therefore tempting to suppose that πᾶσαν here was intended to claim that Philo was translating *all* that was attributable to Sanchuniathon, with the implication that what was not in Philo was not genuine.[11]

804: 23-25 ἀφ' οὗ-συνέστη

Sanchuniathon was interested in learning all of history from all the sources. This, according to Nautin, explains why Sanchuniathon, a Phoenician, searched out the writings of the Egyptian Taautos.[12] Nautin's interpretation is based on an error, as Eissfeldt has shown conclusively that Philo considered Taautos a Phoenician (see below on 804: 25). The significance of the "search from all sources" must be sought elsewhere, which is difficult since Philo never explains why Sanchuniathon was interested in the history of all of antiquity. If one may judge from the fragments of Philo's supposed translation, one might conclude that Sanchuniathon was interested in identifying the inventors of the necessities of civilization and the originators of religious beliefs. If these were his concerns, a search for the histories of all nations would be appropriate. Taautos, the first written and unalterable source, would be a particularly valuable "discovery".

---

[9] Baudissin, "Sanchuniathon," p. 454.

[10] Mras, "Sanchuniathon," p. 176, attempts a different resolution of the contradiction. He proposes that Philo's work contained nine books, as Eusebius says. The first book was world history, while the other eight were Phoenician history. Porphyry counted eight books because he was referring to the books on Phoenician matters. Mras suggests that 816: 25ff. from the second book proves his suggestion of the nature of the division. Kronos, the first king, is discussed in that passage. Phoenician history was therefore the theme of Book Two. Mras' proposal seems highly unlikely, as Kronos is also discussed in fragments from Book One, 809: 11ff. On the nature of the fragments from the other books of Philo's work, see below, p. 260.

[11] The title of Sanchuniathon's work, as Eusebius knew it, was the *Phoenician History*. See 814: 5. Eusebius and Porphyry both knew the book by the same title, and τὴν πᾶσαν τοῦ Σαγχουνιάθωνος is a description rather than title.

[12] Nautin, p. 261. On Taautos = Thoth, see the discussion below on 804: 25.

We have seen and shall see that much of the information in Porphyry and Philo's accounts of Sanchuniathon is of Hellenistic origin or betrays Hellenistic concerns. Combining this fact with Taautos' identification with Thoth (discussed below), the analysis of this passage may perhaps be carried a step further. Hecataeus of Abdera, in his *Aegyptiaka*, makes Hermes (who is obviously Thoth, though Hecataeus uses only his Greek name) a great inventor. Hermes' inventions include language, the alphabet, ordinances and honors for the gods, astronomy, harmony, gymnastics, rhythmical movement, the three-stringed lyre, expositions of thoughts, and the olive tree. Hermes is also described as possessing "ingenuity for devising things capable of improving the social life of man."[13] Hecataeus' tendencies are obvious in the fragment. Even gymnastics and olive culture, characteristically Greek activities (in an Egyptian context), are claimed for the Egyptian Hermes.

To return to Philo, if Sanchuniathon was interested in the history of inventions and if Philo's source describing Sanchuniathon knew the sort of material now found in Hecataeus, Sanchuniathon's search for the works of Taautos may acquire greater significance. Taautos' writings are not only the first written and unalterable records, they are also the memoirs of a great and prolific inventor (i.e. an inventor of more than the restricted list of inventions ascribed to Thoth by the ancient Egyptians[14]).

804 : 25 Τααύτου

Taautos is identified with Egyptian Thoth and Greek Hermes (804 : 29). The identification of Thoth and Hermes goes back at least as far as Herodotus.[15] Eissfeldt has shown that there is abundant evidence in the fragments proving that Philo considered Taautos a Phoenician, including 818: 9 where Taautos is explicitly referred to as a Phoenician.[16]

---

[13] Hecataeus, *FGrH* 264, Frag 25, 15, 9; 16, 1.

[14] Boylan, *Thoth*, pp. 99-101. Troiani, pp. 63-64, also argues that Philo's Taautos = Thoth is based on Hecataeus of Abdera's portrait of Hermes.

Taautos is the inventor of writing (812: 15-17), and it seems obvious that Taautos, as a Phoenician, should have invented a Phoenician form of writing. Nevertheless, Taautos' characters are called "sacred (812: 17)" and are described as if they were hieroglyphs.[17] The resolution of this apparent contradiction will become clearer below when Philo's account is compared to Euhemerus'.

Philo, then, believed Taautos was a Phoenician. However, in fact, (as opposed to Philo's claims) was Taautos merely a Phoenician misspelling of Thoth, or was he an independent Phoenician deity, later identified with Thoth on account of the similarity of their names and/or functions? Bunsen argues for the latter conclusion,[18] citing Varro, *De Lingua Latina*, 5, 10, 57: "*Principes dii Coelum et Terra qui in Aegypto Serapis et Isis, Taautes et Astarte apud Phoenices*, the sky and the earth are the principal deities. They are Serapis and Isis in Egypt, Taautes and Astarte among the Phoenicians." Varro, who wrote two hundred years before Philo, thus assigns a definite role to Taautos. Bunsen considers this passage proof that the Phoenicians worshipped Taautos as one of their chief divinities. However, the phrase *Taautes et Astarte apud Phoenices* is found in only one very corrupt MS. of Varro's work.[19] It is therefore considered an interpolation derived from Philo.[20]

---

[15] Hdt. 2,138,4 See the commentary of How & Wells *ad loc.* Cf. Williams, p. 39.

[16] Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, pp. 6-16. Philo's nationalism (see pp. 83, 231, 267, 268) should also have forced him to make Sanchuniathon's source a Phoenician.

[17] Dussaud, "Invention," pp. 334-337. See also Clapham, p. 136.

[18] Bunsen, Vol. 4, p. 225.

[19] The phrase is found only in MS. B. This Ms. is lost, and is known from the editions of P. Victorius (1535) and A. Augustinus (1554). It is badly edited, full of omissions and interpolations. Collart, *Varron*, p. xxxiii calls MS. B more an adaptation than a MS. of Varro's work.

[20] The phrase is omitted even from the critical apparatus in Collart's edition. The phrase seems to have originated as an attempt to make sense *ut TA TAS EAM*, which Collart understands as *ut taceas eam.*

Eissfeldt has also argued that Taautos was a native Phoenician deity.[21] Eissfeldt concedes that the passage from Varro is an interpolation, but he argues that Taautos, the god who invented writing (804: 26), is the Phoenician name of the deity, derived from his invention. In 809: 9, where Taautos' birth is discussed, he is the son of Misor and the nephew of Sydyk, both of whom are named after abstractions—righteousness and justice. "Taautos", Eissfeldt therefore argues, is also to be explained as a proper noun derived from an abstraction. Following M. Noth,[22] Eissfeldt points to the expression והתוית תו in Ezek. 9: 4, from the root תוה. In discussing the boundaries of the promised land in Num. 34: 7, 8, 10, the Bible uses the words תתאו and והתאויתם derived from the related stem תאה. Eissfeldt proposes that the noun תאוה, "mark"/"marking" be derived from the same root and understands קברות התאוה of Num. 11: 34 as originally meaning boundary marks. תַאֲוַת would be the singular construct form of this noun. The god responsible for the marks of the alphabet, Eissfeldt supposed, might well be called אל תאות. In 812: 15 Taautos is called θεὸς Τάαυτος, which would be a translation and transliteration of that divine title. Later this deity was simply called תאות or Taautos. Eissfeldt concludes that since this name sounded like Thoth, and since Thoth was the inventor of writing in Egypt, the two deities were identified.[23]

Eissfeldt's arguments are weak. The construct requires an object. One cannot simply say אל תאות. One should say something like אל תאות האותיות yet there is no such formulation in Philo. Furthermore, the etymology of תאוה is not free from suspicion, especially since קברות התאוה is perfectly comprehensible in context as "graves of lust."[24]

Lokkegaard has proposed another interpretation of Taautos' functions which would also make him a native and independent Phoenician deity. Lokkegaard bases his argument on the enigmatic Biblical verse

---

[21] Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, pp. 12-24. This interpretation is accepted by Barr, "Philo of Byblos," p. 39.

[22] Noth, *Uberlieferung.*, p. 129.

[23] On Thoth as inventor see Nagel, "Thoth," p. 129.

[24] Williams, pp. 144-145, rejects Eissfeldt without explaining why. For a more cogently argued critique of Eissfeldt see Clapham, pp. 133-137.

Job 38 : 36 : מי שת בטחות חכמה או מי נתן לשכוי בינה. טחות in the verse is in parallelism with שכוי, normally translated as rooster. Lokkegaard therefore thinks טחות must also mean rooster or cock, and he considers טחות the orthographic equivalent of Taautos. Taautos was not originally connected with Thoth but was the animal representative of the native Phoenician god of writing, learning and glyptic art.[25]

Unfortunately for Lokkegaard's argument, טחות appears once again in the Bible, in Ps. 51 : 8, in parallelism to סתום. Here the meaning "rooster" is not satisfactory. Moreover, a Phoenician god of writing, learning, and glyptic art represented by a rooster is otherwise unknown.

Albright's interpretation of Taautos, while totally different from Lokkegaard's, also departs from Job 38: 36. Albright understands Taautos as a person, as the hierophant of Sanchuniathon. In Job 38: 36 he is mentioned as טחות, while שכוי in that verse is the personal name of another Phoenician hierophant. Taautos = טחות also appears in Ps. 51: 8 where his name represents esoteric lore.[26]

Albright's interpretation, however, ignores a basic characteristic of the Philonic fragments. Philo, as a good Euhemerist (see below), turns gods into men; he considers the gods worshipped by people as culture heroes deified for their contributions to society. Philo does not take characters commonly conceived as men and portray them as gods. Philo's identification of Taautos with Thoth and Hermes (804: 29) must mean that like Thoth and Hermes, Taautos would be considered a god (by a non-Euhemerist), not a human hierophant. In other words, when Philo makes Taautos a wise *man* and great authority, that must be Euhemerization, not fact.

A proper understanding of Philo's Taautos is indirectly suggested by the same difficult verse in Job from which Lokkegaard and Albright departed. טחות in Job is simply the transliteration of the name of the Egyptian god Thoth. Thoth is appropriate to the astronomical context of the verse in his capacity as god of the moon, calendar and of the movements of the stars.[27] Pope supposes that שכוי

---

[25] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," pp. 63-64.

[26] Albright, *YGC*, pp. 244-248.

[27] Boylan, *Thoth*, pp. 83-87. See also Bleeker, *Hathor and Thoth*, p. 110. On טחות = Thoth see Pope, *Job*, p. 256. Compare Clapham, p. 133, n. 44: "In the Bible what seems to be the same divine name is spelled טחות (Ps. 51: 8; Job 38: 36)."

is not a rooster, the usual meaning, but the ibis, Thoth's bird.[28] I would suggest that שכוי is neither rooster nor ibis. Ibis can be disregarded as sheer invention. Rooster is suggested by the rabbinic blessing הנותן לשכוי בינה להבחין בין יום ובין לילה, but this blessing may be an attempt to interpret the verse and understand the difficult word, rather than evidence that שכוי was a usual word for rooster. שכוי is rendered by the Targum on the verse as תרנגול ברא the equivalent among birds of the שור הבור and Leviathan of Jewish legend. Another name for this bird in Jewish legend is the ziz bird. The latter is the mythological bird of heaven, the seer and singer of the skies.[29] As such it is an appropriate parallelism for טחות = Thoth. Both are astronomical authorities.

As Thoth became טחות for the author of Job 38: 36, so he became a Phoenician god named Taautos for Philo or his source. This explanation is confirmed by the facts that no other writer knows anything about this pretended Phoenician deity and the many Phoenician inscriptions containing divine names have yielded no trace of him. Accordingly, we may conclude that Taautos is not a native Phoenician deity; he is a Phoenicianization of Egyptian Thoth. This conclusion is supported by several passages within the fragments such as 812: 15-17 where Taautos invents letters called "sacred" and 812: 27ff. where Taautos is assigned dominion of Egypt.[30]

---

[28] See Pope, *Job*, p. 256. Prof. Schmidt informs me that Pope's equation of Thoth and טחות is plausible.

[29] On the ziz bird, see Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 1, pp. 29-30. Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 5, p. 48, n. 139 writes that "In most of the ziz legends the dependence upon Iranic mythology is evident." I would suggest that this conclusion must be seriously reconsidered. The Babylonians told of the Anzu or Zu bird, a god who rebelled against the divine order and stole the tablets of destiny. This mythological bird was ultimately defeated by the storm god (Marduk, Hadad, depending upon the provenance of the tablet). On the Anzu bird see *ANET*, pp. 111-113. The ziz bird might be a similar ornithological rebel of Canaanite mythology. His coupling with the Leviathan in Jewish legend would support such a conclusion. On the Leviathan see Cassuto, *Adam*, pp. 30-31.

[30] Taautos as a Phoenicianization of Thoth is accepted in modified form by Du Mesnil du Buisson, *NE*, pp. 75-77. Cf. Barr, "Philo of Byblos", p. 38. Clapham also accepts this conclusion, but attempts to carry the discussion one step further, by asking how Taautos = Thoth = Hermes was accepted into a Phoenician pantheon. He suggests that this god was identified with Chousor (Ugaritic *kṯr whss*, see 808: 21-24). This suggestion is proven by a complicated chain of arguments. Taautos = Hermes helps fashion a

804: 28 ὥσπερ κρηπῖδα βαλόμενος

This passage makes Taautos Sanchuniathon's, and hence Philo's major source. This relationship is confirmed, for their cosmogonies at least, by 807: 7-9 which ascribes the cosmogony presented by Philo to the "commentaries of Taautos."[31] However, does the attribution to Taautos = Thoth of writings such as those which Philo preserved reflect ancient Egyptian concepts or does it betray a Hellenistic concern?

According to Boylan, Thoth in pre-Ptolemaic Egypt was considered the scribe god,[32] the inventor of writing,[33] and the verbal faculty of the creator god.[34] Thoth was also considered an author. In the Sethos temple at Abydos the incense was prepared "according to the writings of Thoth which are in the library."[35] Ptolemaic temples (e.g. Denderah) often boast of their complete conformity with the plans and prescriptions of Thoth,[36] but even at the times of Ramses II (at Abydos) Thoth was considered responsible for arranging the inner decoration of the temple. The Nine Gods are described as depicted "in their shape which Ptah fashioned, according to what Thoth hath written concerning their bodies in the great register(?) which is in the library."[37] Certain

---

spear and sickle from iron—810: 7. This fits Chousor's functions as iron worker (808: 21-24). In 810: 8 Taautos = Hermes exhorts Kronos' allies. This agrees with the role of Ugaritic *kṯr wḫss* who exhorts Baal to fight Yam when he provides the former with the magic clubs, Gordon, *UT*, 68: 7ff. In addition, Philo writes that Atlas was committed to the depths of the earth at the advice of Taautos = Hermes (810: 16). Yam goes to the netherworld, that is the depths of the earth, at the advice of Ugaritic *kṯr wḫss*, Gordon, *UT*, 68: 25-27. Finally, Taautos received Egypt—812: 28-29. Egypt is apparently the domain or *kṯr wḫss*, Gordon, *UT*, ʿnt: VI: 14-16. Clapham, pp. 138-143. Clapham's entire analysis of Chousor is highly dubious, on which see further the comments on 808: 21-24.

[31] If Porphyry's description of Sanchuniathon is connected to Philo's (on which see below), then the city records of 804: 7-8 were presumably used in other parts of the work.

[32] In a text from the Tut-ankh-Amon shrine. Translation in *ANET*, p. 8.

[33] See note 14.

[34] See the Memphite Theology, translation in *ANET*, p. 8.

[35] Boylan, *Thoth*, p. 96. Boylan does not give a precise reference for the text which he translates. For a similar text of Ptolemaic date see Mariette, *Denderah*, Vol. 1, pl. 72a. See also Bleeker, *Hathor and Thoth*, p. 142.

[36] Boylan, *Thoth*, p. 89.

[37] Mariette, *Abydos*, II, 9. Translations from Boylan, *Thoth*, pp. 90-91. Cf. 812: 15-17 where Taautos imitates the appearances of the gods to fashion the alphabet.

temple regulations were thus ascribed to Thoth and he was regarded as the framer of the rules of sacred decoration and architecture.[38]

None of these Pharaonic works ascribed to Thoth are at all like the Hermetic literature later ascribed to him, or the similar material Philo attributes to Taautos = Thoth.[39] Festugiere's conclusions concerning the date of the sources of the Hermetic literature are therefore relevant to our problem. Festugière writes:

> *Ces allusions assez vagues ne permettent pas de conclure que les temples d'Egypte, sous les Pharaons aient possédé dans leur archives un ensemble d'ouvrages attribués au dieu Thoth. Par contre, il semble que des les Ptolémées il ait existé une littérature hermétique grecque.*[40]

As in the case of the Hermetic literature, the attribution by Philo of cosmogonic and mythological works to Taautos = Thoth is a clear indication that Philo's sources for this fact in the description of Sanchuniathon were of Hellenistic date or later.

805: 1-3 ταῦτα-ἀνάγουσι

The subject of this clause must be Philo since the clause is from Eusebius' introduction to a quotation from Philo's introduction to his translation (804: 19-21). Furthermore, when the discussion turns to Sanchuniathon and his discovery, Sanchuniathon is introduced ὁ δὲ (805: 8).

Philo can either accuse the more recent writers of *deriving* the stories about the gods *from* allegories and physical accounts and expositions (that is, the allegories and physical accounts precede the stories); or he can accuse these writers of distorting the *stories* by interpreting them allegorically and physically (the stories precede the allegories). Since 805: 1-3 is from Eusebius' introduction to a quotation from Philo, the choice should be made in light of the quotation. Philo himself takes the latter course. He accuses the more recent writers of

---

[38] Boylan, *Thoth*, pp. 90-91.

[39] On the similarities between Philo's cosmogony and parts of the *Corpus Hermeticum* see below, Chapter Six, pp. 124-125.

[40] Festugière, *Révélation*, Vol. 1, p. 76.

"rejecting the events as they occured (805: 4-5)." That is, Philo (as a good Euhemerist, on which see below) believes the "historical" stories came first. These stories were distorted by later writers with incorrect interpretations.

The difficulty with my translation is that μῦθος in 805: 2 must be understood as what Philo would call the correct and "historical" stories about the gods, while throughout the Philonic quotation which follows, the word means the distorted versions (produced by the later priests) of the "historical" material (e.g. 805: 5). This objection is not decisive since 805: 1-3 was written by Eusebius and his usage need not be consistent with Philo's.

805: 1-3 contains one further difficulty. Since *Philo* accuses the more recent theologians, the allegorical interpretations were current in his time. It is never stated, however, that these interpretations were current in Sanchuniathon's time. Yet Sanchuniathon supposedly searched for the true sources and rejected the allegories (805: 11-13). The later priests (of 805: 13-14) hid Sanchuniathon's work in order to return, *once again* (*palin*) to the incorrect versions of the stories.

Perhaps we may suppose that Eusebius has omitted a section in which Philo noted that the allegorical and physical interpretations were also current in Sanchuniathon's time. Or it may be that Philo simply took for granted that, since the temples already existed in Sanchuniathon's time (as they had to if Sanchuniathon was to find the documents in their *adyta*), therefore the allegorical interpretations, official in the temples of his own time, also existed in Sanchuniathon's time. Philo may have made this assumption without being aware of the difficulty it entailed for his theory. He wanted Sanchuniathon to reject the official, priestly interpretations (as he himself did) but he did not stop to think that by making Sanchuniathon do so he asserted the antiquity of these same interpretations, which he was elsewhere concerned to represent as posterior inventions. Whatever the case, Philo informs the reader (in the section Eusebius has preserved) that the theologians who came after Sanchuniathon are to be blamed for going back to the allegories although Sanchuniathon, long before, had found the true sources and on the basis of these sources had rejected the allegorical interpretations.

Philo's accusation of the allegorizers shows his critical method. In the process, however, he has also attributed a similar critical approach to Sanchuniathon. Such an attribution, as Williams noted, is anachronistic, and must be another of the aspects of the descriptions of Sanchuniathon betraying Hellenistic concerns.[41]

Why does Philo hate the allegorizers and physiologizers? The answer is explicitly stated: Philo (as we shall see more fully below) was a Euhemerist, and has his own understanding of the myths. He therefore opposes the allegorical and physiological interpretations of these same myths offered by others.

The identity of these allegorizing and physiologizing opponents is a more difficult question. Troiani suggests that part of the answer may lie in Philo's opposition to the Jews (see 818: 2-6). Philo displays two clear dislikes, to Jews and to allegorizers etc. Perhaps, Troiani suggests, these two antipathies were related. The allegorical interpretation of scripture had become a major aspect of Judaism as known to Philo. Philo's opposition to allegory is therefore, at least in part, opposition to Jewish allegory.[42] The difficulty with this explanation is obvious: Philo makes it plain that his allegorizing opponents are fellow pagans. Thus after telling his version of the Life of Kronos, Philo comments that his version is the original later allegorized and physiologized by the priest Thabion (813: 4ff.). The context of Philo's opposition to allegory is thus pagan, not Jewish.

I believe the identity of Philo's opponents can be inferred from a passage in *De Iside*, by Philo's contemporary Plutarch. Plutarch, especially in *De Iside*, represented everything Philo opposed; physiological and allegorical interpretations of the myths of Isis and Osiris abound.[43] It would therefore seem likely that Plutarch was the sort of person Philo had in mind when writing against allegorizers and physiologizers. Confirmation of this supposition is provided by a passage in which Plutarch writes against Euhemerus, who:

---

[41] Williams, p. 37. See also Troiani, pp. 46-47. Compare the following remark by Oldenburg, *Conflict*, p. 165: "It is therefore very important to listen to such a distinguished scholar as Sanchuniathon, who made a thoroughgoing research of the origin of Canaanite religion."

[42] Troiani, pp. 34-37 & 50-51. On Phoenician-Jewish rivalries see further Levy, *Olamot*, pp. 60-78.

[43] *De Iside* 355 B-D. For a Phoenician example of physiologizing interpretation see the passage from Pausanias quoted and discussed below, p. 231.

> of himself drew up copies of an incredible and non-existent mythology and spread atheism over the whole inhabited earth by obliterating the gods of our belief and converting them all into names of generals, admirals, and kings, who forsooth, lived in very ancient times and are recorded in inscriptions written in gold letters at Panchon, which no foreigner and no Greek had ever happened to meet with, save only Euhemerus.[44]

Plutarch's remarks show that the dislike between allegorizers and physiologizers on the one hand, and Euhemerists on the other, was mutual. Each group used "critical" arguments against the other. Plutarch's comments thus demonstrate that Philo's opponents must have been allegorizers and physiologizers like Plutarch.

805: 7 μυστήρια

I have translated the word as "mysteries", in the technical religious sense, a meaning dictated by κατέστησαν. Philo is no friend of the mysteries. In his view they are sheer humbuggery, invented by frauds who based them on misappropriated allegory in order to further their own pretensions. For somewhat different reasons, Lucian shares this dislike; both Philo and Lucian thus opposed the popular religious tendencies of their times.[45] Attributing such opposition to Sanchuniathon is anachronistic.

The analysis of Philo's opposition to allegory, physiology, and mystery suggests one further conclusion. Philo is not writing as a dispassionate historian. Rather, he is a vehement opponent of much that was popular in his day. His work is thus rooted in the intellectual and religious world of the Roman Empire.

805: 9 'Αμμουνέων

Before discussing the meaning of this word and of Sanchuniathon's discovery, it should be noted that Philo makes no explicit connection between the texts of the 'Αμμουνέων (whatever they may be) and the works of Taautos-Thoth. There are two possibilities: the texts of the 'Αμμουνέων may be more of Sanchuniathon's supposed sources, in addition to the works of Taautos,[46] or, more likely, they themselves are the lost works of Taautos.[47]

---

[44] *Ibid.* A-B.

[45] See Beaujeu, *Religion Romaine*, pp. 32-36 and pp. 165-174. See also Troiani, p. 48.

Several interpretations have been offered for ῾Αμμουνέων and for the entire phrase. The oldest, that of Bochart, would connect Philo's ᾿Αμμουνέων with the חמנים of Lev. 26: 30 (and other Biblical passages). Following Rashi, Bochart considered the חמנים temples of the sun god. Philo, according to Bochart, claimed that Sanchuniathon discovered texts in these temples written in a special sacred alphabet.[48] This interpretation has found little favor in recent years, as it is now clear that Biblical חמנים, Palmyrene and Nabatean *ḥmn*',[49] and the deity Baal *ḥmn*,[50] form a complex of potentially separate questions, each of which is unrelated to the problem of Philo's ᾿Αμμουνέων.[51]

Eissfeldt emphasized that Philo discusses the γράμμασι of the ῾Αμμουνέων, and γράμμασι means letters (as in 804: 26-27 where they are clearly distinguished from ὑπομνήματα, treatises). ῾Αμμουνέων is thus, according to Eissfeldt, the name of an alphabet, specifically a name for the Ugaritic alphabet, so called because the alphabet was used in the region of the Amanus, i.e. Ugarit.[52] Eissfeldt's suggestion can be discarded; its only basis is his *a priori* conviction that Philo had access to sources like those found at Ugarit (Cf. Eissfeldt's interpretation of the mysterious three letters, 813: 9). Furthermore, Dussaud has argued convincingly against Eissfeldt that when an author of Philo's date uses the term 'Αμμουνέων the reference is probably to Egyptian temples.[53]

---

[46] If Porphyry and Philo's accounts of Sanchuniathon are to be combined (see n. 31 and below, pp. 90-91), the ᾿Αμμουνέων texts are not only supplementary to Taautos but also to the city records.

[47] Again, if Porphyry and Philo's accounts are to be combined, the ᾿Αμμουνέων texts and Taautos would be the temple records in Porphyry.

[48] Bochart, p. 773.

[49] CIS II, 3978; RES 2053, 2115. See also Teixidor, "BES 1976," #16 & 176, pp. 307 & 336.

[50] See e.g. KAI 24, 16 and 61, 4. See also Teixidor, "BES 1976," #44, pp. 312-313.

[51] Teixidor, "BES 1974", #50, p. 308. The literature on these questions is quite extensive. See Ingholt, "Hamman," pp. 797-799; Starcky, "Dedicace Palmyrienne," pp. 51-55; Milik, *Dedicaces*, pp. 305-306; Teixidor, "BES 1968" #98, pp. 381-382. On Baal *ḥmn* see also Chapter Seven, pp. 154-5 & 173-4. Philo's ᾿Αμμουνέων are only mentioned by Ingholt who remarks that on his interpretation of חמנים and *ḥmn*' it is obvious that they have nothing to do with Philo's ᾿Αμμουνέων.

[52] Eissfeldt, *RS*, pp. 10-12. Clemen, p. 11, accepts Eissfeldt as does Mras, "Sanchuniathon," p. 177. Troiani, as usual, is a bit confused and indecisive. He rejects Nautin's proposal as too speculative (p. 62) and inclines towards Eissfeldt (p. 65), but he cannot (rightly) believe that Philo really used one ancient source (p. 66). He concludes that if ᾿Αμμουνέων refers to the letters of the Ugaritic alphabet, Philo's work would acquire notable historical importance. On Troiani's indecisiveness see Parente, "Troiani," p. 218.

Nautin's proposal seems most attractive. He notes that ἀπόκρυφα γράμματα usually means secret religious books. He suggests that 'Αμμουνέων is an error for 'Αμμωνεῖων the genitive plural of 'Αμμωνείον the common name in the papyri for a temple of Ammon. Nautin therefore translates: "*ayant consulté les Ecritures secrètes qu'il avait trouvées dans les sanctuaires d'Ammon où elles étaient conservées*".[54] Nautin understands all the dative plurals as modifying γράμμασι, and notes that the separation of noun and modifier was common in Philo's period. Nautin's emendation and explanation place the supposed setting of these "events" in Egypt.[55] If so, Sanchuniathon was conceived as a philosopher who traveled to Egypt and there discovered ancient wisdom. Such figures were familiar in Greek literature from at least Herodotus' time.[56] This aspect of the portrayal of Sanchuniathon may thus be another of the details which betrays Hellenistic concerns.

M. Smith has suggested a slight modification of Nautin's translation which makes the text clearer. Understanding all the dative plurals as modifying γράμμασι is difficult. Furthermore, Eissfeldt is correct; Philo uses γράμμασι to mean letters and not texts (804: 26). Smith proposed placing a comma between 'Αμμωνεῖων and γράμμασι. The translation would then be: "having consulted the secret [texts] found in the *adyta* of the temples of Ammon, [texts] composed in letters not known to all". These texts were written in some strange system of writing, presumably like hieroglyphics. This translation has the further advantage of making the statement that "Sanchuniathon worked out the interpretation of these texts" clear : Sanchuniathon had to decipher the texts.

---

[53] Dussaud, "Ecriture," pp. 297-298. On discoveries in temples of Ammon see pp. 80-82.

[54] Nautin, p. 264. Iamblichus, *Myst.* 8,5, in which the prophet Bitys interpreted the lost works of Hermes—found in *adyta* at Sais, written in hieroglyphics—is parallel to our case. The parallel is not complete as Bitys explained these works *to* King Ammon.

[55] Cf. Dussaud, "Byblos," p. 302, n. 3. Clapham apparently agrees with Dussaud: 'Αμμουνέων, according to Clapham are "Ammoneans, attendants or associates of the Egyptian Thoth in residence in his Canaanite cult." Clapham, p. 134. Cf. Dussaud's more moderate comment, "Ecriture," pp. 297-298.

[56] See Hdt. 2, 109, on which see further K & R, pp. 77-78.

Is there any possibility that Sanchuniathon discovered texts such as those which Philo presents and in the manner which Philo describes? Such discoveries must have been made at least occasionally in antiquity, as in the case of the Shabaka stone,[57] if forgers were able to claim that they had "discovered" the works they were publishing.[58] The extensive use of this claim by forgers, however, is grounds for suspicion;[59] in Philo's case the evidence suggests that his account was invented, not true. A *terminus post quem* is also apparent.

A magical papyrus at Oxyrhynchus of the third century A.D. claims to be an ἀντίγραφον ἱερᾶς βίβλου τῆς εὑρετίσης [*sic*] ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ ταμίοις, "copy of the holy book found in the archives of Hermes."[60] Cumont compares this papyrus with another which reads : βίβλος εὑρεθεῖσα ἐν Ἡλιουπόλει τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐν ἀδύτοις ἐγγεγραμμένη ἐν ἱεροῖς γράμμασι, "a book found at Heliopolis in Egypt in the temple, in the *adyta*, written in sacred characters".[61] Nautin calls attention to the story of Pibechos. Ammon the god and king discovered the teachings of Thoth and hid them in an *adyton*. Ostanes found and published these texts and Pibechos translated Ostanes' work into Greek.[62] This would be an almost exact parallel to the story Philo tells concerning Sanchuniathon, particularly if the writings of the Ἀμμουνέων were, as argued above, the lost works of Taautos = Thoth.

A final reason for suspecting Philo's story is its resemblance to Euhemerus' account of the discovery of Zeus' history of his own life. This is particularly significant as Philo was a Euhemerist (see below). Euhemerus writes :

---

[57] See Erman, "Denkmal," pp. 918-919 and p. 925.

[58] Speyer, *Bücherfunde*, pp. 142-145. See also Leipoldt and Morenz, *Heilige Schriften*, pp. 24-36.

[59] Speyer, *Bücherfunde*, pp. 125-141. Cf. the circumstances surrounding the discovery in 2 Kings 22 : 8ff. Perhaps that book was planted to be discovered.

[60] P. Oxy. 6, #886, lines 2-5.

[61] *Catal. Codd. Astr. Graec.* vii, p. 62 *ap.* P. Oxy. 6, p. 201.

[62] See Nautin, p. 286 and Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, p. 107, n. 1 and pp. 363-364.

> ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ἱερῷ στήλην εἶναι χρυσῆν ἐν ᾗ τοῖς Παχγαίοις γράμμασιν ὑπάρχειν γεγραμμένας τάς τε Οὐρανοῦ καὶ Κρόνου καὶ Διὸς πράξεις κεφαλαιωδῶς
>
> In this temple there is a stele of gold on which is inscribed in summary, in the writing employed by the Panchaeans, the deeds of Ouranos, Kronos, and Zeus.[63]

Another fragment of Euhemerus (3,46,8) tells us more about these supposed Panchaean letters. The stele was written in "the letters the Egyptians call sacred." The two fragments of Euhemerus apparently contradict each other: according to one the Panchaean stele was written in Panchaean letters, according to the other in hieroglyphs. The most reasonable resolution of the apparent contradiction is to assume that Euhemerus intended to suggest that the Panchaean writing system was similar to hieroglyphs.[64] Philo, as we have seen, has a similar apparent contradiction. A Phoenician, Taautos (818: 9), invented writing but his system is described as if it were hieroglyphs (812: 15-17). The contradiction in Philo is to be resolved by the assumption that Philo intended to suggest that Taautos' Phoenician letters resembled hieroglyphs.

Philo and Euhemerus both base their accounts on a secret source written in the local language in a writing system that resembled hieroglyphs. They thus share more than a theory about the origins of religion (see below): they agree on this minor detail. In this light I think it beyond doubt that Philo's account of Sanchuniathon's "discovery" was a fiction, invented by Philo to make his story fit the Euhemeristic model.

This is the first of a number of minor agreements between Philo and Euhemerus to be noted in the commentary. Philo also shares minor agreements on small details with another Euhemeristic historian, Dionysios Skytobrachion, as will be discussed at the appropriate places in my commentary. In a few instances, Euhemerus, Philo and D. Skytobrachion all agree on some small point. The number and nature of these agreements makes it clear that the Euhemeristic school had certain historiographic commonplaces or canons.[65] To the extent we can judge from the sparse fragments of the other Euhemeristic historians and of the *Phoenician History*, Philo's work conformed to these canons.

---

[63] Euhemerus, *FGrH* 63, Frag. 2.5. See also Speyer, *Bücherfunde*, pp. 111-115, 121-122.

[64] I follow the suggestion of Vallauri, *Evemero*, p. 54. Cf. the less sucessful proposals of Jacoby, "Euhemerus," col. 963 and Brown, "Euhemerus," p. 261, n. 11.

805: 23 Παραδόξου ἱστορίας

This is the title of Philo's polemical work. Παραδόξος can mean incredible, contrary to expectation, irrational, or remarkable. Perhaps Philo chose this title because his book disagreed with the currently accepted interpretations. The title should then be translated, in modern terms, as *The Unconventional* or *Non-conformist History.*

The significance of the charge against the Greeks (here, in 805: 18-19, and in 813) and of many of the comments Philo makes on the translation from Sanchuniathon, is clear in the light of Hellenistic historiography. Bickerman has shown that Greek scholarship created a "scientific" pre-history for the Greeks. "Scientific" methods were applied to Greek mythology to create this pre-history. When, however, these same methods were applied to barbarian pre-history, the Greeks retained the framework and chronology of Greek mythology. In particular, barbarian pre-history was forced into the events of the Trojan War.[66] Hecataeus of Abdera (ca. 300 B.C.) was the first to react against this hellenocentric pre-history. Josephus argues that Hebrew history is much more ancient and better preserved than Greek history.[67]

This tradition of barbarian reaction was alive when Philo was active and even after his death. *Corpus Hermeticum* 16,1 contains a charge against the Greeks similar to Philo's:

> Ἑρμῆς ... ἔλεγεν ὅτι δόξει τοῖς ἐντυχάνουσι μου τοῖς βιβλίοις ἁπλουστάτη εἶναι ἡ σύνταξις καὶ σαφής, ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἐναντίων ἀσαφὴς οὖσα καὶ κεκρυμμένον τὸν νοῦν τῶν λόγων ἔχουσα, καὶ ἔτι ἀσαφεστάτη, τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὕστερον βουληθέντων τὴν ἡμετέραν διάλεκτον εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν μεθερμηνεῦσαι, ὅπερ ἔσται τῶν γεγραμμένων μεγίστη διαστροφή τε καὶ ἀσάφεια

---

[65] See further the summary below, pp. 242-243.

[66] Bickerman, "Origines Gentium," pp. 70-71.

[67] Josephus *C. Ap.* 1, 11-14.

> Hermes ... said that to those who come upon my books their composition will seem absolutely straightforward and clear, although on the contrary, it is obscure and hides the sense of the words. It will be yet more obscure when the Greeks later get the idea of translating the books from our language into theirs. A complete distortion of the text and total obscurity will result.[68]

A charge against the Greeks even closer to Philo's is in Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* 3, 32. Apollonius is in India and the Indians are surprised that he is such a decent fellow because:

> διαβάλλουσιν ... τὸ Ἑλλήνων γένος οἱ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου φοιτῶντες ἐνταῦθα σφᾶς μὲν αὐτοὺς ἱερούς τε καὶ σοφοὺς ἀποφαίνοντες καὶ νομοθέτας θυσιῶν τε καὶ τελετῶν, ὁπόσας νομίζουσιν οἱ Ἕλληνες, ἐκείνους δὲ οὐδὲν ὑγιὲς εἶναι φάσκοντες, ἀλλ᾽ ὑβριστάς τε καὶ ξύγκλυδας καὶ ἀναρχίαν πᾶσαν καὶ μυθολόγους καὶ τερατολόγους, καὶ πένητας μὲν ἐνδεικνυμένους δὲ τοῦτο οὐχ ὡς σεμνόν, ἀλλ᾽ ὑπὲρ ξυγγνώμης τοῦ κλέπτειν.
>
> The visitors who come here from Egypt ... malign the race of Hellenes, and while declaring that they themselves are holy men and wise, and the true law-givers who fixed all the sacrifices and rites of initiation which are in vogue among the Greeks, they deny to the latter any and every sort of good quality, declaring them to be ruffians, and a mixed herd addicted to every sort of anarchy, and lovers of legend and miracle mongers, and though indeed poor, yet making their poverty not a title of dignity, but a mere excuse for stealing.[69]

Philo's charge against the Greeks is obviously in the same tradition. The Phoenicians, according to Philo, have the true religious traditions, but these traditions were misappropriated and distorted by the Greeks, which has led to the errors discernible in the Greek accounts.[70] We thus have further confirmation, if that were necessary, of the conclusion reached above; Philo's work is rooted in the intellectual and religious concerns of the Roman Empire.

---

[68] Translation after that of Festugière. For the date of the *Corpus Hermeticum* see Nock's remarks in his edition, p. v. See also Williams, p. 47.

[69] Translation after that of Conybeare in LCL.

[70] Philo is not the sole Phoenician representative of this tradition, as will be clearer by the end of this study. For a parallel discussion, using slightly different evidence, see now Oden, "Philo of Byblos," pp. 118-125. Cf. Mras, "Sanchuniathon," pp. 182-183.

805: 25-806: 10

Before making detailed comments on this passage, I should note that Philo divides the deities worshipped by the most ancient barbarians into two classes: deified kings and culture heroes (805: 25-806: 7), and the sun, moon, planets, elements, and other immortal physical gods (806: 7-10). The same classification of gods is found in Euhemerus.[71] The conclusion that Philo was a Euhemerist is obvious.

806: 3 στῆλας

By chance we know from Philo himself what these *stēlai* were. In 817: 8 Philo says that *Nasibis* are *stēlai*. *Nasibis* is a transliteration of Phoenician נצב[72] or Ugaritic *ṇsb*,[73] מצבה in Biblical Hebrew, a column or pillar dedicated to the gods.[74]

These *stēlai*, Philo says, were dedicated to the memory of dead[75] kings or benefactors. Williams properly notes that Philo's remarks are confirmed and illuminated by the passage of the epic of Aqhat which mentions erecting *stēlai* for ancestors as a primary task of a son.[76]

806: 3 ῥάβδους

It is known that wooden staves were employed in the worship of some ancient Semitic deities, including Phoenician gods.[77]

806: 5-7 εξαιρέτως-ἐπέθεσαν

The meaning of these phrases is elucidated by 809: 15ff. We learn there that Ouranos and Ge were originally names of mortals, given to the sky and earth on account of their beauty. This is a specific example of the principle stated here.[78]

---

[71] Euhemerus *FGrH* 63, F 2,2. Clapham, pp. 15-16, has argued that the structure of the rest of the fragments also follows Euhemeristic classification. First come cosmogonies (the natural gods), then the accounts of the divinized humans (culture heroes, Life of Kronos). Troiani's argument, p. 45, that Philo's Euhemerism differed from that of Euhemerus, is unconvincing.

[72] See CIS I, 123 = Cooke, *Textbook*, p. 103 = KAI 61. See also CIS I, 139 = Cooke, *Textbook*, p. 108 = KAI 64.

[73] Gordon, *UT*, #1685, p. 446.

[74] On *stēlai* in the Phoenician religion see Bisi, *Stele Puniche*, pp. 23-48.

[75] Εἰς τὸ χρεὼν of 806: 2 is, of course, a euphemism for dying. See Gifford, *Eusebii Pamphili* Vol. 4, p. 38.

[76] See Gordon, *UT*, 2 Aqht: I: 27. Williams, p. 153. Clapham, p. 104.

[77] Reed, *Asherah*, pp. 99-101, figs. 11, 13, 15.

iii

As presented by Eusebius, the quotations from Philo's introduction to his translation of Sanchuniathon end at 806: 10. I believe it possible that Eusebius has preserved one further paragraph from that introduction, but that this paragraph has been misplaced within the account of the origins of mankind.

This passage is 807: 10-19 (ἀτολμίᾳ) in Jacoby's edition. The following is a translation of the text as edited by Jacoby:

(Eusebius)

(807: 10) After these things, mentioning the names of the winds Notos, Boreos and the others, he continues:

(Philo)

(807: 11) But to these,[79] the ancients consecrated the products of the earth and considered them divine; (807: 12) and they worshipped those things upon which they and all those who either followed or preceded them continued to live; (807: 14) and they established offerings of drink and incense. (807: 14) But they reserved pity, compassion, and weeping for the departing growth of the earth, and for the first origin of living things from the earth, and for [their origin] from each other, and for their end when they departed from life.

---

[78] Cf. Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 804, n. 9.

[79] I have emended the printed text in Jacoby and read: ὅτι τουτοῖς ἀφιέρωσαν, as in *P.E.* 1,9,5. See the critical apparatus *ad loc.* My reasons for following the reading of 1,9,5 are: (1) since 1,9,5 preserves the proper order (see below) it should also express the proper relationship between the "cosmic deities" and the products of the earth; (2) the usual construction with ἀφιερόω, with an indirect object, is retained; (3) the introduction of a new class of agricultural deities is avoided; (4) the phrase ταῦτα-διεγένοντο (807: 12) which would seem to refer to plant and animal life can be understood as referring to the elements without which plants and animals could not live.

(Eusebius)

(807: 17) And he continues:

(Philo)

(807: 17) These were the notions [expressed] in [their] worship, corresponding to their weakness and their lack of daring at that time.

This passage, as presented by Jacoby, is itself a composite. The passage which originally stood between the end of Philo's cosmogony and the account of the birth of Aion and Protogonos has been conflated with a similar passage from 1,9,5. Jacoby rightly saw that the two were variants of the same text. He did not, however, notice the introduction of the 1,9,5 passage which is a variation of 806: 7-10, and which proves that the entire passage translated above should be read as a continuation of 806: 7-10.

When one reads the passage as a continuation of 806: 7-10 several difficulties disappear: (1) there are people to do the consecrating, the παλαίτατοι of 805: 25. In its current position there are none.[80] (2) The statements about the religious notions of the ancients no longer contradict those made in the introduction. Moreover, the sequence of events: beginnings of the world (806: 15-26), birth of animals (806: 27-807: 5), and the birth of mortal men (807: 19) is not interrupted. (3) The winds Notos and Boreos are excellent examples of the τὰ τούτοις συναφῆ of 806: 9, and were mentioned by Philo's authority, Euhemerus, as examples of immortal deities.[81] For all these reasons, I propose that the passage be read as part of Philo's introduction.

---

[80] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 812, n. 9 was disturbed by the passage. Clemen, p. 40, saw the possible connection with 1,9,5, but did not propose moving the text. Orelli, p. 12, n. 9 was most aware of the difficulties. He realized that in its current position there was no one to do the consecrating. He therefore suggested that Eusebius had omitted the account of the birth of the first humans from Boreos and Notos (analogous to the birth of Protogonos and Aion from Kolpia in 807: 19). These people did the consecrating. Orelli's solution is incorrect for two reasons: (1) Protogonos' name implies that he has no predecessors; (2) the humans who did the consecrating cannot be the first humans since they consecrated those things upon which they... *and their predecessors* lived (807: 13). In this regard Wagenfeld is perhaps most interesting of all. Wagenfeld was intelligent, if unscrupulous. In his forgery of Philo's *Phoenician History*, pp. 10-11, Wagenfeld omits the entire passage. Perhaps Wagenfeld saw the passage did not fit its context and therefore thought it an interpolation and hoped, by omitting it, to be able to pass off his text as more primitive, better preserved, less interpolated than the common form.

The structure of the entire introduction would therefore be as follows: Philo began with the definition of the mortal deities (805: 7-806: 1) and then depicted the manner of their worship (806: 1-5). After the transition to the immortal divinities (806: 5-7), Philo defined those gods. The ὥστε clause (806: 9-10) is a Euhemeristic sneer, an aside aimed at those who believe in other gods. Philo then described the cult offered to the immortal gods (807: 10-17) and concluded the entire introduction with the summary in 807: 17-19.

The tone of the entire introduction is highly polemical as is the passage I propose to move to the end of the introduction. Philo remarks, for example, that by contrast to the sacrifices and libations offered the cosmic deities, pity, compassion, and weeping were reserved for the departing growth of the earth and the birth and death of animals.[82] Weeping for the departing growth of the earth alludes to the lamentations at harvest time common in the Near East.[83] This was commonly explained as mourning the death of a god.[84] Philo is criticizing that explanation by remarking that the first (and more sensible) men worshipped only great men and immortal gods. They had no occasion to mourn such gods, and properly reserved weeping and compassion for transient animal, vegetable and human lives.[85] The implied argument is one which Christian polemic was to make classical —if properly mourned as transient, not divine; if divine, then eternal, therefore not properly mourned.

---

[81] Euhemerus, *FGrH* 63, Frag. 2,2.

[82] I take ζῴων in the usual manner and translate it as "animals." The word can mean living thing, in a general sense, and include plant life, as in Plato, *Timaeus* 77B. This latter usage is rare and may be exclusively philosophical. Furthermore, the statement that "pity, compassion, and weeping were reserved for the origin of ζῴων from each other" fits animals better than plants. Most important of all, the birth of ζῴων is spoken of as distinct from the growth of the earth.

[83] Gaster, *Thespis*, pp. 30-31.

[84] This may also be a reflection of the Egyptian practice of mourning the death of sacred animals. See Hdt. 2, 65-76.

[85] Philo's statement that the birth of animals was mourned is puzzling. To the best of my knowledge this practice is not mentioned in any other ancient document. Perhaps the text is to be emended to something like: "They reserved pity, compassion and weeping for the departing growth of the earth and for the race of animals, [both] that first [born] from the earth and that from other animals, in their death, at the time when they departed from life." This possibility involves understanding γενέσει as "for the race"—possible but unlikely—and replacing the καὶ before τελευτῇ by ἐν (or reading κατὰ τελευτήν). The Greek of the entire sentence, emended or not, is very odd,

Full proof of my hypothesis concerning the proper place of 807: 10-17 requires an explanation of how the passage was misplaced. Eusebius himself knew the correct order, since he preserved it in 1,9,5. The error must be attributed either to a deliberate change by Eusebius or to a scribal error in the copying of the *P.E.* Such an error would have had to occur early, since the incorrect order is found in all the MSS. Since I can find no reason for a deliberate alteration by Eusebius, the second alternative is preferable.

If a scribe realized that he had omitted material, he would copy the missing passage in the margin or on the bottom of the page; marks would indicate the proper place.[86] If these marks faded or were accidentally erased, a later scribe might misplace the passage. In our case it is easy to see why 807: 10-17 would have been put in its present position: it begins with a discussion of the winds Notos and Boreos and in the passage which follows, the wind Kolpia is the father of Protogonos and Aion. 807: 10-19 was placed before the passage on Kolpia because both discussed winds.[87]

iv

Having concluded the discussion of the quotations from Philo's introduction to his supposed translation of Sanchuniathon, several further questions may be asked. Is the passage from Porphyry on Sanchuniathon, discussed in the previous chapter, original to Porphry, or are Porphyry's remarks based on what he read in Philo? Or are

---

especially because of the lack of articles where one would expect them. One thing in Philo's comment is, however, clear. Philo shared the widespread belief that the first animals were born from the earth and that when the earth stopped producing living things, reproduction took over. Cf. D.S. 1,7,7.

[86] See Kenyon, *Books and Readers*, p. 71.

[87] The mistake would have been made by associative organization. A good example of this type of organization is in the Mishnah, Gittin 4: 2-5: 9. Gittin 4: 2 contains an example of תקון עולם (a rabbinic decree altering the law for the benefit of society) related to divorce. The Mishnah continues 4 : 3-5 : 9 and presents many examples of such decrees unrelated to divorce. Clapham, pp. 76-78 has also posed the problem of the location of 807 : 10-19. Our solutions are similar, but independent.

both Porphyry and Philo drawing their information on Sanchuniathon from a common source with either one or both reworking that common source to suit his polemical purposes?

It would seem natural that Porphyry should faithfully reflect Philo because Philo is one of the two known sources concerning Sanchuniathon prior to Porphyry, and because Porphyry mentions Philo's translation of Sanchuniathon at the end of his biographical sketch (804: 11-12) and in *De Abst.* 2,56 = 803: 3-5. Nautin, however, has called attention to the discrepancies and contradictions between Porphyry and Philo's accounts of Sanchuniathon.[88]

Philo, Nautin argues, simply describes Sanchuniathon as a learned and curious man (804: 22-23). Philo does not date Sanchuniathon.[89] The only important fact he reports concerning Sanchuniathon is the latter's use of the works of Taautos and discovery of the documents of the ’Αμμουνέων. Porphyry, however, states that Sanchuniathon's work was based on the book of Hierombalos, which, in turn, was dedicated to King Abibalos and approved by him and by the investigators of truth at Hierombalos' time. Porphyry placed Sanchuniathon at the time of the Trojan War. Furthermore, Porphyry describes Sanchuniathon's sources as city records and temple documents, and not as the writings of Taautos. All this, according to Nautin, suggests that Porphyry is reworking the description of Sanchuniathon given by Philo in order to make Sanchuniathon seem more official, ancient and reliable. Nautin considers the fact that Eusebius must quote Porphyry (and not Philo directly) decisive proof that Eusebius did not find in Philo what he found in Porphyry, and that Porphyry did retouch the Philonic account for his own polemical purposes.

Eissfeldt interprets the same data oppositely.[90] Porphyry, he argues, had independent knowledge of Sanchuniathon. This knowledge was the basis of his remarks in the quotation. Philo drew on the same tradition but was less specific with regard to Sanchuniathon's dates, generally more vague, and made Sanchuniathon's sources secret temple texts, in order to strengthen his Euhemeristic reworking of Sanchuniathon.

---

[88] Nautin, pp. 271-272. The differences between Porphyry and Philo's accounts of Sanchuniathon are noted but not analyzed by Loewenstamm, "Philon," pp. 315-316.

[89] Nautin maintains that Philo does not date Sanchuniathon, but as we shall see, this is not wholly correct. Unlike Porphyry, Philo does not *directly* date Sanchuniathon, but does date him *indirectly*. When Philo maintains that Hesiod and other Greek poets based their work on perverted versions of Sanchuniathon's books, 813: 4-22, he must be dating Sanchuniathon prior to Hesiod.

[90] Eissfeldt, *S. von B.*, pp. 36-46.

The ease with which Eissfeldt can propose reversing Nautin's conclusions shows the weakness of both arguments. The relationship between Porphyry and Philo is much more complex than either scholar supposed. Philo discusses Sanchuniathon's use of the writings of Taautos and the documents of the Ἀμμουνέων. The greatest enemies of the truth, in Philo's view, are some priests, therefore Porphyry probably did not derive from Philo the report that Sanchuniathon used the works of the priest Hierombalos.

The key to the relationship between Porphyry's and Philo's accounts of Sanchuniathon is the supposition, suggested in the previous chapter, that Porphyry has combined two descriptions of Sanchuniathon. When Porphyry writes of the Sanchuniathon, the authority on Jewish history who used the work of Hierombalos, he is following some non-Philonic source. Porphyry, as a Tyrian, could well have had access to such a source.

The second part of Porphyry's description of Sanchuniathon, his use of the city and temple records may be based on Philo. The city and temple records may be an elaboration or alternative description of Philo's writings of Taautos and documents of the Ἀμμουνέων. Porphyry's use of these Philonic traditions would justify his reference to Philo's translation. Thus his portrait of Sanchuniathon would emerge as a composite of independent information and material derived from Philo.[91]

Another question which must be considered is how Eusebius knew Philo. Bunsen argued vigorously that Eusebius did not know Philo directly but only from quotations preserved by Porphyry.[92] Among more recent scholars, Gifford shares this opinion.[93] They would consider not only 803: 26-804: 12 a quotation from Porphyry, but also the entire selection until 813: 23, where Eusebius states that Porphyry testifies to the truth of the information contained in the quotations he has cited; or perhaps even all the material to the end of Book One of the *P.E.* This interpretation of the quotation from Porphyry at 803: 26-804: 12 and of the appeal to Porphyry's authority at 813: 23, misses the significance of Eusebius' use of Porphyry. These passages do not prove that Eusebius found the Philonic material in Porphyry. They only show that Eusebius wanted to establish (and remind his reader) that Porphyry considered Sanchuniathon reliable, in order to free himself from the suspicion of having fabricated the Philonic fragments and in order to embarrass Porphyry with Sanchuniathon's opinions. Bunsen and Gifford's attempt to determine how Eusebius knew Philo is unsuccessful, and the question remains unanswered and is perhaps unanswerable. There is, however, no reason to doubt the obvious—that Eusebius knew Philo's work as a whole and, realizing that Philo would be useful for his attack on paganism, arranged to have some juicy passages excerpted.

---

[91] Baudissin, "Sanchuniathon," p. 454, reached a similar conclusion. Cf. Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 51, who asserts that the two parts of Porphyry's description are not incompatible. Williams, pp. 141-143, maintains that Porphyry has combined two different but not contradictory accounts.

[92] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 799, n. 3.

V

The evidence presented on one crucial point merits recapitulation before passing to the next chapter. Almost all the information concerning Sanchuniathon presented by both Porphyry and Philo is of Hellenistic date or betrays Hellenistic concerns. Porphyry's statement that Hierombalos, Sanchuniathon's source, dedicated his book to Abibalos is of Hellenistic date. Porphyry's date for Sanchuniathon, before or at the time of the Trojan War, is an example of the attempt of barbarian historians to prove their sources older than Homer. Sanchuniathon is a named authority for both Philo and Porphyry. In Philo's account, Sanchuniathon's use of the writings of Taautos = Thoth and the sort of writings attributed to Taautos = Thoth are both akin to the Hellenistic Hermetic literature. The critical method ascribed to Sanchuniathon is an anachronism, while Philo's story of the discovery of the lost writings of the ᾿Αμμουνέων is a *topos*. The *terminus post quem* for Philo's story is Euhemerus, whose theories on ancient religion Philo, and supposedly Sanchuniathon, shared.[94]

---

[93] Gifford, *Eusebius*, p. 36.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER FIVE

M. Smith suggested that a comparison of the context of the sentence 806: 7-9 in p. 806 and Eusebius *P.E.* 1,9,5, affords an insight into Eusebius' reliability and his use of sources. It is clear that the original order is as in 805: 25-806: 10: the mortal divinities and their cult, the transition to the immortal divinities and the description of the immortal divinities. In 1,9,5, Eusebius has retained only the description of the immortal divinities, the equivalent of 806: 7-9. The reason for the omission of the first three quarters of the original Philonic passage is clear. Eusebius' purpose in the section which begins in 1,9, is to prove that "the ancients worshipped no other gods than the celestial luminaries, knowing nothing of the god of the universe, nor even of the erection of carved images, nor of daemons."[95] One reason Eusebius may have analyzed paganism in this manner is Deut. 4: 19, which Eusebius himself quotes (1,8,30b.) Philo's original passage, if quoted in full, would clearly contradict Eusebius' contention, since it discusses the mortal benefactors of humanity deified by a grateful posterity. Philo implies that the worship of these culture heroes preceded the worship of the physical gods when he states that the names of Phoenician kings were given to the elements of the cosmos (806: 5-7). Eusebius could not quote the entire Philonic passage in 1,9,5, without contradicting his own argument. He therefore quoted 806: 7-9 which, out of context, would not disagree with his contention.

---

[94] Eissfeldt, *RS*, p. 88, n. 2, suggests that Euhemerism was Philo's pet theory, and therefore was prominent even in works which Philo admitted as his own. Eissfeldt points to 821: 18-21, a fragment from Philo's geographical work. Philo's direct dependence on Euhemerus is thus clear even if Renan and many others are correct in arguing that the nature of the Phoenician religion was such that it lent itself readily to Euhemeristic analysis. See Renan, p. 263; Albright, *YGC*, p. 223; Barr, "Philo of Byblos," pp. 34-35; Troiani, p. 45. The Euhemerism attributed to Sanchuniathon thus remains a criterion for dating, (and grounds for suspecting) the absolute, unadulterated antiquity of the material in Philo according to virtually all scholars. See Eissfeldt, *RS*, p. 83; Williams, pp. 50, 152-153; Loewenstamm, "Philon," p. 316; Clapham, pp. 17-21. Baudissin, "Sanchuniathon," pp. 462-463, followed by Clemen, pp. 75-76, are the only ones to have doubted this conclusion. Baudissin argues that Euhemerism is not a criterion because Euhemerus took his system from the Sidonians. As evidence Baudissin cites Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 14,658E-F = *FGrH* 63 F 1 : Εὐήμερος ... ἱστορεῖ, ὡς Σιδωνίων λεγόντων τοῦτο, ὅτι Κάδμος μάγειρος ὢν τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ παραλαβὼν τὴν ῾Αρμονίαν αὐλητρίδα καὶ αὐτὴν οὖσαν τοῦ βασιλέως ἔφυγεν σὺν αὐτῇ. "Euhemerus ... tells a story on the authority of the Sidonians that Kadmos was the king's cook, and that taking Harmonia, a flute player who also belonged to the king, he escaped with her." Euhemerus obviously learned this story from Sidonians, but this passage will not support Baudissin's contention that Euhemerus learned his system from them. Finally (as indicated above, p. 82), the *Phoenician History* shares many details with the writings of Euhemerus and other known Euhemeristic historians (most notably, Dionysios Skytobrachion, *FGrH* 32). One can therefore speak of the *Phoenician History* as conforming to the canons of Euhemeristic historiography. Sanchuniathon's agreement with Euhemerus is complete and pervasive. The problem for dating the material in Philo posed by this agreement cannot be avoided.

When Eusebius turns to the Philonic fragments quoted at the end of 1,9 (804: 22-806: 14), his purpose is to prove that "the stories about the gods among other nations (i.e., not the Phoenicians and Egyptians) are of later introduction."[96] The review of Phoenician theology is supposed to prove this. Philo's words do support Eusebius' contention. Philo argues that the Greeks received distorted versions of the true Phoenician stories about the gods (805: 15-16). However, in presenting a review of Phoenician history, Eusebius quoted the entire section 805: 26-806: 10 and thus exposed his unscrupulous use of 806: 7-9 in 1,9,5.

This analysis, combined with the appendix to the previous chapter, confirms the conclusions concerning Eusebius' reliability and the difficulty of interpreting Philo presented in the third chapter. Eusebius did not consciously alter the words of the texts he quoted (although occasionally his quotations may be sloppy), but he did not always interpret his sources correctly. The author's actual words, which Eusebius has on the whole correctly preserved, *may* sometimes prevent our being misled by Eusebius' errors or his deliberate deceptions, but we are not always so fortunate as in the comparison of 806: 7-9 and 1,9,5. When there is no other evidence Eusebius can easily mislead his reader. All this should serve as a reminder of the tentativeness of all interpretations offered for Philo.

---

[95] This is the heading of the first part of 1,9 as it appears on p. 27b.

[96] This is the heading of the last part of 1,9 as it appears on p. 30d.

CHAPTER SIX

THE COSMOGONY

i

As this chapter is the first in which fragments of Philo's supposed translation of Sanchuniathon will be discussed, a few general remarks seem appropriate at the outset. In the extant fragments Philo does not date Sanchuniathon directly. Philo's date for Sanchuniathon can, however, be inferred from 813: 4-22: Sanchuniathon's work was deformed by misinterpretation and eventually reached Greece to become the basis of Hesiod's *Theogony*. Sanchuniathon, according to Philo, must therefore have lived before Hesiod—long enough prior to Hesiod for the intervening process of misinterpretation and transmission to be completed. A date late in the second millennium B.C. or early in the first millennium would therefore seem proper.[1] Porphyry, on the other hand, dates Sanchuniathon directly—at the time of the Trojan War. Eusebius (following Porphyry, and perhaps Philo's allusions) calls Sanchuniathon a most ancient man, who lived before the Trojan War. Sanchuniathon's writings, therefore, allegedly date from the late second millennium B.C. Nevertheless, as was concluded at the end of the previous chapter, the data in Porphyry and Philo's descriptions of Sanchuniathon are derived from a Hellenistic milieu. This must arouse suspicion concerning the texts which Philo presents as his translation of Sanchuniathon. Do the fragments reflect ancient Phoenician beliefs, as Philo claims, or do they reflect the beliefs of Hellenized Phoenicians?

Testing the antiquity of beliefs or doctrines is complicated by the fact that some elements may be old, others new. Thus names of gods or festivals may survive long after the notion of the god or practices in the festival have changed completely. This may have occurred in Phoenician religion. Another, closely related, source of difficulty is the fact that some elements, like names, are handed down from one text to another, relatively unchanged,[2] so their occurrence at a late date is no proof that they were directly derived from an ancient text. Several deities mentioned by Philo may have been otherwise virtually unknown or totally incomprehensible before the discovery of the Ugaritic epics,[3] yet this does not prove that Philo's immediate sources were as ancient as the Ugaritic literature. Such examples (and even the agreement of the larger structure of a relatively recent text with the structure of an older text) *prove* no more than that the older text may have been ultimately, a source of the more recent work. Only if the congruences between the texts include essential and characteristic elements ought we conclude that the more ancient text was an immediate source of the more recent and/or that the latter preserved intact and relatively unaltered passages contained in the former.

---

[1] It is impossible to be more precise. Two crucial questions are unanswerable: (1) when Philo dated Hesiod (for the problem in general see West, *Theogony*, p. 40); and (2) how much time to allow for the process of transmission.

---

[2] Consider the history of the deities El, Baalshamem, Anat, Reshef and Baalat Gebal. El, an important figure in the Ugaritic epics, is named in the Azitawada inscription (KAI 26 A III, 18). Philo describes El as having six wings (812: 21ff), a description confirmed by numerous Byblian coins. See below Chapter Nine, pp. 225-226. El also appears in KAI 129 of the second century.

Baalshamem is mentioned in KAI 4,3 from Byblos of the tenth century, as well as in the Azitawada inscription (KAI 26 A III, 18). He is also found in a Carthaginian inscription (KAI 78,2).

Anat is one of the principal figures of the Ugaritic epics. The bilingual inscription to her, CIS I, 95 in which she is identified with Athena, is well known.

The god Reshef is found compounded in several names known from Ugarit, such as *bn ršp* (Gordon, *UT*, 64: 12). He was very popular on Cyprus and many Cypriot names are compounded with his, such as רשפחץ of CIS I, 10, 4. On Reshef see also Teixidor "BES 1969," #86 and "BES 1970," #68 & 69.

Baalat Gebal, is often mentioned in the Amarna letters (See Mercer *EA Tablets*, Vol. 2, p. 901 for a list of passages). She is also mentioned in KAI 5,2 from Byblos and dated to ca. 925 B.C., and in CIS I,2 of the fourth or fifth century B.C.

Dahood, "ASD," pp. 69-71 misinterprets this continuity as the "stability" of the Canaanite religion from the Late Bronze Age to the Hellenistic period. Cf. Teixidor, *The Pagan God*, pp. 5-6.

[3] Deities in this category are Mot and Chousor. Philo mentions a Mouth, the god of death, in 812: 9-11. This is of course the Ugaritic Mot. Philo also mentions a certain Chousor who invented iron and its use (808: 21ff.). Although Chousor may be intended in several Punic and Neo-Punic names (e.g. עבדכשר and כשריתן, on which see Teixidor, "BES 1970," #69, and Benz, *Personal Names*, p. 336), his functions were not understood until we learned of the Ugaritic artisan god *kṯr wḫss*. For an example of the earlier lack of comprehension see Meyer *GdA*, Vol. II,2, p. 180, n. 5. Cf. Eissfeldt, *RS*, pp. 28-29.

These methodological principles are relevant to the analysis of Philo's cosmogony (and the related doctrines which Eusebius classifies as his "zoogony," together 806: 15-807: 9),[4] the subjects of this chapter. Philo claims to have derived these doctrines from a Phoenician source, Taautos (807: 7-9) via Sanchuniathon. Whoever Taautos or Sanchuniathon may be, it is clear that the ultimate source of the cosmogony and zoogony was Phoenician. The enigmatic *Mōt* of 806: 21, the *Zophasēmin* of 806: 24, and the poetic form of the whole (all discussed below) establish this point beyond doubt.[5]

For these reasons, all other things being equal, explanations of Philo's cosmogony in Phoenician terms are preferable to non-Phoenician ones. Nevertheless, we should not adopt the extreme opposite position—that a Phoenician interpretation must be discovered and accepted in all cases.

Before discussing other sources of the cosmogony, less obvious than the ultimate Phoenician source, let us turn to the text.

ii

(Eusebius)

(806: 11) Philo, having expounded these things in the Introduction, begins next the translation of Sanchuniathon, and sets forth the Phoenician theology more or less as follows:

(806: 15) He posits at the beginning of all things dark and windy mist, or a blast of dark mist, and a turbid, watery *chaos*, dark as Erebos. (806: 16) These things were boundless, and throughout a long period of time had no bound. He says:

(Philo)

(806: 17) And when the wind loved its own primary elements and a mixture resulted, that plexus was called Pothos (Desire). This [plexus] is the source of the creation[6] of all things. But he [Pothos][7] did not know his own creation. (806: 20) And from his connection [with the wind], *Mōt* was born of the wind. (806: 21) Some say that [*Mōt*] is slime, others the putrefaction of a watery mixture. (806: 22) And from this [putrefaction] was born every seed of creation and [the] origin of all [things]. (806: 23) And there were some living things which had no sense perception, from which living beings possessed of intellect were born. And they were called *Zophasēmin*, that is observers of the heavens, and they were formed like the shape of an egg. And *Mōt* blazed forth the sun and the moon, the stars and the great luminous bodies.[8]

---

[4] I will argue for the unity of these passages and for their derivation from *one* source. I will therefore use the term "cosmogony," interchangeably with "cosmogony and zoogony," as titles for the passages discussed.

[5] See Schwabl, "Weltschöpfung," cols. 1495-1496, n. *.

(Eusebius)

(806: 27) Such then is their cosmogony, which openly introduces godlessness. Let us next see how he says the generation of animals arose. He says, accordingly:

(Philo)

(806: 28) And when the air burst into light, on account of the burning of both the land and sea, there arose winds and clouds and great downpourings of the waters of heaven and floods. (806: 31) And when [the waters] were set apart and separated from their original place on account of the sun, (807: 1) then all things met each other again in the air and clashed together, thunders and lightnings were produced. (807: 3) And as a consequence of the crashing of the thunders, the intellectual beings mentioned above were aroused, (807: 4) and as a consequence of the sound they were frightened, (807: 5) and male and female were set in motion in earth and sea.

(Eusebius)

(807: 6) Such is their account of the generation of animals. After these things, the same author continues and says:

---

[6] "Creation," is used throughout to render Greek *ktisis*. Concepts such as *creatio ex nihilo* should not however be read into Philo.

[7] For *auto* read *autos*. See the commentary *ad loc.*

[8] For Jacoby's ἥλιός τε καὶ σελήνη I have read ἥλιόν τε καὶ σελήνην. See the commentary *ad loc.*

(Philo)

(807: 7) These are the things which were found written in the cosmogony of Taautos and in his commentaries from both conjectures and proofs which his intellect saw, and found, and revealed to us.

iii

One of the things which distinguishes the cosmogony from the other fragments is the constant use of the conjunction καὶ. This conjunction is used approximately thirty times in twenty lines. Renan, the first to notice this usage, considered it a Semiticism, a reflection of the recurrent *waw* in Hebrew;[9] Lagrange and Clemen continued this line of argument, and Clemen added that the original which Philo supposedly translated may have been poetic.[10] Clemen does not explain this comment, but merely notes several similarities between Philo's cosmogony and the first chapter of Genesis.

Clement's hint can be developed further, as was done by Hölscher.[11] The author of Philo's source(s) for the cosmogony and zoogony clearly used the technique of poetic parallelism—the technique of Biblical and Ugaritic poetry—in composing his work. Descriptions of events are often repeated, with little new information added in repetition. On other occasions the text offers alternative explanations with little difference between the alternatives.[12] The list below includes some of the clearer examples:

(1) 806: 15 ἀέρα ζοφώδη καὶ πνευματώδη // ἢ πνοὴν ἀέρος ζοφώδους. The only differences are the substitution of πνοή for *pneuma*, and the shift from an adjectival to a nominal construction.

---

[9] Renan, p. 255. Cf. Gruppe, p. 376.

[10] Clemen, p. 39; Lagrange, p. 408.

[11] Hölscher, "Anaximander," pp. 394-395. I reached the same conclusion independently. See also Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 53.

[12] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 807, n. 1 was most confused by the tautologies and repetitions, which he attempted to remove by emendation. Williams although citing Hölscher's article (in his bibliography, p. 214), explains the repetitions and alternatives as "the translator groping for the right word." See Williams, p. 32. Williams is probably dependent on West, *Theogony*, p. 26. Clapham consistently attempts to discover distinctions between the parallel stichs, e.g. pp. 29 & 32, although he does seem to recognize the poetic nature of the text in remarks on p. 47. It is perhaps significant that Hölscher is not cited in Clapham's bibliography.

(2) 806: 16-17: ταῦτα δὲ εἶναι ἄπειρα // καὶ διὰ πολὺν αἰῶνα μὴ ἔχειν πέρας. There is no difference between the statements.

(3) 806: 18 : ἐγένετο σύγκρασις // ἡ πλοκὴ ἐκείνη ἐκλήθη Πόθος. After stating that a σύγκρασις arose, the text refers again to the mixture (as a πλοκὴ) and says that this πλοκὴ was called Pothos.

(4) 806: 21-22 : τινές φασιν ἰλὺν // οἱ δὲ ὑδατώδους μίξεως σῆψιν. The alternatives are very similar—mud or the putrefaction of a watery mixture.

(5) 806 : 22-23 : πᾶσα σπορὰ κτίσεως // καὶ γένεσις τῶν ὅλων. Once again, a single idea is repeated.

(6) 806: 26 : ἥλιός τε καὶ σελήνη // ἀστέρες τε καὶ ἄστρα μεγάλα. The phrase falls into two distinct parallel units.

(7) 806: 31-807: 1 : διεκρίθη // καὶ τοῦ ἰδίου τόπου διεχωρίσθη. The fact of separation is repeated.

(8) 807: 2 : συνήντησε πάντα ἐν ἀέρι τάδε τοῖσδε // καὶ συνέρραξαν. Meeting and clashing together are probably two terms for the same event.

(9) 807: 3-5 : πρὸς τὸν πάταγον τῶν βροντῶν ... ἐγρηγόρησεν // καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἦχον ἐπτύρη. The crashing of the thunders awakens the animals and the noise frightens them—another case of repetition.

Hölscher concludes that the text which Philo presents is a translation of a Phoenician poem, a conclusion which I tentatively share. There is a minor difficulty posed by sentences which lack parallelism, such as 806: 19-21. This lack of parallelism, however, partly may be ascribed to the translator,[13] partly may have been original in the Semitic poem.[14]

More serious and important is the problem posed by the alternate explanations. Biblical and Ugaritic parallel stichoi are not commonly true alternatives,[15] they are usually equivalents, complements, or antitheses. Nevertheless, real alternatives are twice found in our text, in examples one and four above. Perhaps here too the translator is responsible; or perhaps Eusebius is responsible. In example one it is particularly probable that Eusebius or the translator misunderstood the parallel phrases as alternate explanation.

---

[13] See Katz, "Septuagintal Studies," p. 202.

[14] If the lapses from strict parallelism came from the original they might be a criterion for dating. See below n. 138.

[15] But they do occur, e.g., Ps. 139: 8.

The poetic structure leads to one further important hypothesis. Parallelism is used throughout the two sections which Eusebius distinguished as Philo's cosmogony and zoogony, and is not discernible in any other section of the fragments. Therefore in spite of Eusebius' division into two apparently different sections, the entire passage 806 : 11-807 : 5 forms a whole, derived from one source. The two parts may therefore be used to interpret each other.[16]

iv

The next section of this chapter should be devoted to a commentary on Philo's cosmogony, in which the text would be analyzed and conclusions concerning the nature and date of its sources drawn. Hölscher and Albright, however, have attempted to answer the latter questions virtually without consideration of the contents, using arguments based mainly or even solely on the poetic form of the cosmogony.[17] It seems simpler to consider their positions before beginning the commentary.

Philo asserts that the Phoenician texts he has translated were very ancient and were indeed Hesiod's sources (813: 11-17). Hölscher argues that a comparison of the Hittite Kumarbi epic,[18] and Hesiod's *Theogony* shows that there was an *Urverwandschaft*, a primitive affinity, between these works. Philo's "Life of Kronos (809: 14-811: 20)" shares elements with both the Kumarbi epic and Hesiod.[19] On the basis of this evidence Hölscher concludes that the Philonic "Life of Kronos" stands between the Kumarbi epic and Hesiod's *Theogony*. Philo's assertions about the antiquity of his source must be accepted as true. Sanchuniathon is thus further "rehabilitated."[20]

---

[16] It is of course not impossible that Philo or his source may have used two different Semitic poems about creation; there were presumably many such poems. But the similarity of the two sections makes the supposition of a single source a plausible working hypothesis.

[17] Hölscher, "Anaximander," p. 395; *Albright*, YGC, p. 226, n. 46.

[18] Translation of the text in *ANET*, pp. 120-123.

[19] Hölscher, "Anaximander," pp. 392-393.

[20] The rehabilitation is based largely on evidence of the type cited in n. 3 above.

Turning to the cosmogony, Hölscher proves its poetic form and Phoenician origin and argues that this form and certain similarities between the cosmogony and the first chapter of Genesis prove that the cosmogony was not influenced by Greek thought, "*dass wir es hier mit einer von griechischer Philosophie unbeeinflussten semitischen Kosmogonie zu tun haben.*"[21] Therefore in the analysis of the cosmogonic sections of Hesiod's *Theogony*, and particularly of the terms Chaos and Eros, while one ought not conclude that these terms were derived from Philo's sources, one must understand these terms in view of their function in the Philonic cosmogony.[22] One ought to understand the organization of the *Theogony*: cosmogony followed by succession-myth, similarly.[23] Finally, Ancient Near Eastern cosmological speculation, such as that preserved for us by Philo, prepared the ground for Anaximander.[24]

Hölscher never suggests a precise date for the immediate source of Philo's cosmogony, although he obviously believed that Philo's immediate source antedated Hesiod and Anaximander. Albright, following Hölscher, attempts to date the immediate source more precisely. He argues that the absence of the second millennium repetitive style in the text suggests a date between the tenth and eighth centuries B.C., before Genesis 1-2: 3a.[25] Albright, however, does not explain why he believes the immediate source of the cosmogony could not have been written after the eighth century B.C.

To conclude, Hölscher has offered (and Albright has accepted and expanded) two proofs for the antiquity of the source of the cosmogony and its freedom from Greek influence: the demonstrated antiquity of Philo's "Life of Kronos," and the poetic form of the text. These proofs will be analyzed and criticized in the following section.

V

The problem of the relationship between Philo's "Life of Kronos" the Kumarbi epic, and Hesiod's *Theogony* will be discussed in detail in the commentary on the relevant passages. For our purposes here it is sufficient to note that the nature and date of the sources of the "Life of Kronos" are probably totally irrelevant to the nature and date of the source of the cosmogony. The cosmogony is the only section of the fragments in which traces of poetic parallelism may be seen, as it is the only section in which *kai* is used constantly. It is therefore virtually certain that the source of this section must be different than the sources of the other sections. Whatever date is assigned to the sources of the "Life of Kronos" proves nothing about the date of the source of the cosmogony.

---

[21] Hölscher, "Anaximander," p. 395.
[22] *Ibid.*, pp. 397-398.
[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 403-4.
[24] *Ibid.*, p. 418.
[25] Albright, *YGC*, p. 226, n. 46.

Hölscher's second argument, that the poetic form necessarily proves the lack of Greek influence, is astounding. We know relatively little about the techniques and history of Phoenician poetry. What evidence we possess is sufficient only to confirm the basic conclusion that Phoenicians wrote their poetry in parallelism.[26] In view of the lack of Phoenician poetry it is impossible to judge Hölscher's contention by reference to Phoenician texts. The considerable remains of the poetry of the neighboring Jews, however, afford an indirect but decisive answer. The Jews employed the parallelistic technique in writing their poetry throughout the Second commonwealth.[27] The technique was used in poems which were influenced by Greek thought,[28] and in fact, in poems written in Greek.[29] In view of this evidence, Hölscher's argument that the poetic form of the text proves, *a priori*, that it is free of Greek influence is incredible.

---

[26] Several Phoenician inscriptions, either written in poetry or in which the author waxed poetic, prove this point. See, for example, Cross' comments on the Arslan Tash plaque, Cross, "Incantation," p. 44. See also KAI 1, KAI 24,8 and KAI 14, 11-12 and the comments in Greenfield, "Scripture and Tradition," p. 254. See also Avishur, "Word Pairs," and "Studies."

[27] The technique was used in composing many of the poems preserved in the Apocrypha. See I. Macc. 3: 1-9 and Judith 9: 1-4; 16: 1-25. In the Pseudepigrapha see Jubilees 22: 11-23 and chapter 46 of Enoch. There are many other passages. On the New Testament see Burney, *Poetry*, pp. 63-95. The Dead Sea Scrolls are most instructive, particularly as they are preserved in the original language. See DSW XI: 13-15; DSD X: 16-20; DST V: 20-23. On the Damascus Document see Rabin, *Zadokite Documents*, p. x.

[28] Ben Sira 11: 35, 13: 3, 20: 18, 24: 3 are good examples. Segal, *Ben Sira*, pp. 10 & 25, discussed these verses and the general question of Greek influence in the book.

[29] I refer to Wisdom of Solomon. Parallelism is not consistently employed in the book. This has been one basis of the many attempts to divide the work into sources. However, the inability of scholars to establish the boundaries of the sources, when taken together with other evidence for the unity of the book suggests that the book

Albright's argument for a date between the tenth and eighth centuries B.C. for the source of Philo's cosmogony is more difficult to evaluate. Albright is certainly correct in noticing the absence of the second millennium repetitive style in the cosmogony and he is probably correct in concluding that the source could not have been written before the tenth century. The difficulty lies in his opinion that it could not have been written after the eighth century, an opinion which, as was noted above, he does not explain. If Albright's date was based on the nature of the poetic style it was a hazardous and injudicious conclusion. The study of Biblical style and syntax has yielded principles on which to base a date for Biblical poems.[30] But such dates *cannot* be simply transferred to Phoenicia in the absence of extensive Phoenician evidence, and certainly cannot be applied to a Phoenician text known only in Greek excerpts. If Albright's conclusion was based on the similarities to Genesis it was equally hazardous. The date of Gen. 1-2: 3 is not beyond doubt,[31] and similarities to Genesis are not sufficient criteria for the dates of the Enuma Elish, the Book of Jubilees, or Corpus Hermeticum III to mention three obvious examples.

In conclusion, the analysis of the form and style of Philo's cosmogony indicates its ultimate Phoenician source and suggests a date after the second millennium B.C., but does not suggest a more precise date for the more proximate source. The precise date cannot be determined from form and style alone, but must depend on analysis of the contents. A fresh start therefore will be made in the following commentary.

---

was not composite but that the author gradually wearied and dropped the technique. The original language was probably Greek. We thus possess a document written in Greek in the first half of which the poetic techniques of Biblical literature were employed. Furthermore, the influence of Greek philosophy on Wisdom of Solomon is apparent, as can be seen from a comparison of Wisdom 9: 15 and Plato, *Phaedo* 81C. Concerning these points on Wisdom of Solomon see Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. 1, pp. 521-524 and 532. Pfeiffer, *NT Times*, pp. 319-321 and 331; Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, pp. 600-603.

[30] See for example D. A. Robertson, *Linguistic Evidence*.

[31] For two widely differing dates of Genesis 1-2: 3 and of the P traditions of which it is a part see Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, pp. 207-208, and Kaufmann, *Religion*, pp. 175-200.

vi

This commentary has several purposes in addition to the obvious task of explaining the translation above. Every cosmogony has what could be called an agenda, a list of phenomena whose origins the cosmogony will describe. These agendas are sometimes quite limited; not every cosmogony attempts the comprehensiveness of Genesis 1. The Egyptians of Hermopolis, for example, were unconcerned about the origins of celestial bodies (other than the sun), vegetation, animal or human life.[32]

It is impossible to be certain of the agenda of Philo's cosmogony since only the excerpts quoted by Eusebius have survived, but some judgment can be made on the basis of these extracts. The agenda included explanations of the origins of male and female animal life. It may also have accounted for celestial bodies, such as the sun, moon, and stars. The decision whether or not it did so depends on the interpretation of two key passages, and on the exact relationship between *Mōt*, the egg, and the celestial bodies (806: 23-26).

Another question which must be considered is that of the nature and date of the source of the cosmogony. This question will be particularly difficult to answer since we know so little about the cosmogonic notions of the Phoenicians. There are a few sparse hints in the Ugaritic epics, a huge chronological gap, a few hints in early Phoenician inscriptions, another huge chronological gap, and then the cosmogonies preserved by Greek authors and Philo of Byblos. This lack of Phoenician comparative material necessitates a heavy reliance on non-Phoenician parallels.

Several lines of analysis have already suggested that Philo's ultimate source was Near Eastern, specifically Phoenician. We must now ask whether parallels confirm this suggestion, and must also attempt to determine the nature and date of the more proximate source of the cosmogony. The first step is to see what in the cosmogony can or cannot be accounted for in Near Eastern terms. Only Near Eastern parallels will therefore be cited in this section of the commentary;

---

[32] See Brandon, *Creation Legends*, pp. 23, 55-56.

those directly relevant will be discussed in the text, those more general will be mentioned in the notes.[33]

806: 15 ἀρχὴν

Bunsen proposed the sense adopted—beginning—his word was "origin."[34] The word cannot mean first principle in this sentence since ἀρχὴν is singular, while two things, ἀήρ and *chaos* follow. The sense in which ἀήρ and *chaos* were considered the origin of things will be discussed below on 806: 17.

806: 15 ὑποτίθεται

This word indicated that the original sentence has been paraphrased. Presumably it has also been abridged. Abridgement would explain the schematic presentation of the cosmogonic process, which makes it impossible for us to be certain about the complete agenda of the original. It is more likely that Eusebius is paraphrasing Philo rather than Philo paraphrasing his alleged source Sanchuniathon. Eusebius often abridges his sources.[35] Direct citation begins (as it commonly does in Eusebius)[36] with φησίν in line 17.

806: 15 ἀέρα ζοφώδη

Literally this phrase means "dark air." It could also mean "dark cloud," based on the equivalence of ἀήρ and שחק in the Septuagint.[37] My translation is based, first of all, on the obvious fact that air is dark when misty or cloudy. Moreover, ζόφον ἠεροέντα, meaning "dark mist," is a set phrase in the Iliad.[38] This idiom remained alive, and its use is attested for Chrysippus who spoke of ἀέρα ζοφερόν, misty air.[39]

---

[33] Clapham's interpretation of the cosmogony forms a consistent and coherent whole different from mine; it is impossible and unfair to discuss Clapham piecemeal, in comments on individual passages or words. I have therefore reserved the Appendix to this chapter for a discussion of Clapham's interpretation.

[34] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 807, n. 1. Clapham, p. 22, n. 2. argues much like Bunsen. He also proposed the interpretation of the phrase adopted here—as an adverbial accusative of time.

[35] See the use of D.S. in Book 2 of the *P.E.* and the notes in Mras, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, Vol. 1, pp. 58-78. Cf. Clapham, p. 22 who argues that Sanchuniathon, not Philo, is the subject of the verb.

[36] See *P.E.* 1,9,12; 2,2,52; 2,6,8.

[37] Ps. 18: 12 = 17: 12 (LXX).

[38] Homer, *Il.* 12,240; 15,191; 23,51; Cf. 21,56.

806: 16 *Chaos*

According to LSJ s.v., *chaos* can mean either infinite space, unformed matter, unformed water, the nether abyss, or a chasm. I have chosen the translation "watery *chaos*," thus making Philo's "turbid *chaos*, dark as Erebos," the equivalent of the *Tehom* covered by darkness in Genesis 1: 2.[40]

The origin of all things from water in Philo's cosmogony is confirmed by one of the few hints on cosmogonic matters we possess from the Ugaritic epics and Phoenician inscriptions. El, in the Ugaritic epics, lives at the sources of Tehom.[41] El is also the creator god in the Ugaritic epics. He is called *ab adm*—"Father of Man,"[42] and *bny bnwt*—the "Creator of Creatures,"[43] In the Azitawada inscription El is *qn ʾrṣ*—the "Creator of Earth."[44] El, who lived at the sources of *thmtm* was a creator god. This is in essential agreement with Philo's cosmogony which states that the origin of all things was watery *chaos*, but considerable demythologizing has intervened between Ugarit, Azitawada, and Philo's cosmogony. The personality of the god El has been replaced by the physical element with which he was associated. The demythologizing, however, is not complete; the elements still behave as if they were deities: the *pneuma* "desires" its own primary elements as the deities in earlier myths were enamored of their parents or children. Similarly, Pothos—or the wind—is "ignorant" of his own origins.

---

[39] SVF, Vol. 2, frag. 429.

[40] Cf. Apsu and Tiamat of the Enuma Elish and Berossus frag. 12 (Schnabel).

[41] Gordon, *UT*, 51: IV: 20-22. Translation: *ANET*, p. 133. See also Ezechiel 28: 2. This verse by itself should be sufficient to refute the position of Pope, *El*, pp. 102-103 and Oldenburg, *Conflict*, pp. 106-109 that El goes to the depths of the waters in exile. Furthermore, the notion of El's exile is obviously dependant on the prior notion of a conflict between El and Baal as a result of which El is exiled. The latter, as we shall see below on 811: 25, is highly dubious.

[42] Gordon, *UT*, Krt: 37.

[43] *Ibid.*, 2 Aqht: I: 25.

[44] KAI 26 A III, 18. See also KAI 129. This title is obviously behind the formula in Gen. 14: 19 and behind Gen. 14: 22 in which YHWH should be omitted following the Septuagint and the Syriac. On the Genesis verses see Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, p. 46, n. 12.

El becoming watery *chaos* is not the sole case of demythologizing in the cosmogony. *Mōt* of 806: 21, as I shall argue below, is perhaps best understood as a similar demythologizing of Ugaritic Mot. The demythologizing is therefore a pervasive characteristic of the cosmogony, and has been recognized as such by scholars. Disputes, however, have centered around the interpretation of this phenomenon.

Eissfeldt, for example, begins by noting the similarities between the Kumarbi epic and the "Life of Kronos." He next mentions the semitic poetic nature of the cosmogony discussed by Hölscher.[45] Eissfeldt points out the many parallels between Philo's cosmogony and Greek scientific cosmogony (most notably the cosmogony in Diodorus Siculus 1,7,1-7) and concludes that the scientific aspects of Philo's cosmogony are not due to Greek influence. Rather, the reverse is true; Philo's cosmogony was a source and inspiration for Greek rationalism.[46]

There are several weaknesses in Eissfeldt's position. First, he is building on Hölscher and, as we have seen, that is a weak foundation to build on. Moreover, as Clapham has noted, Philo's cosmogony is the only piece of Phoenician evidence Eissfeldt can cite for his conclusion.[47] A more serious weakness is the fact that Eissfeldt overlooked significant differences between Philo's cosmogony and Diodorus'. Thus while there are some general, vague, similarities, the roles of the sun in the two texts are very different: in Philo the sun causes rain, in Diodorus it dries the land. Diodorus' cosmogony procedes by a progressive differentiation of the elements; incestuous reunions of the elements predominate in Philo. The most serious weakness in Eissfeldt's conclusion, however, is the fact that it is based on an interpretation of Diodorus' cosmogony which has since been proven incorrect. When Eissfeldt wrote his comparison of the two cosmogonies it was generally accepted that Diodorus' was based on the doctrine of the Pre-Socratic school of the Atomists.[48] Since then, however, Spoerri has proven that Diodorus' cosmogony is a product of the Hellenistic world, and represents a synthesis of cosmogonic notions popular in Diodorus' own times.[49] Any similarities between Diodorus and Philo hardly prove the antiquity of the latter, or that Phoenicians were the first to discover rational ways of explaining natural phenomena. In summary, Eissfeldt's explanation of the relationship between Philo's cosmogony and Milesian science should be rejected. The demythologizing and depersonalizing of the gods which has been noted is inexplicable in Near Eastern terms.[50]

---

[45] Eissfeldt, "Kosmogonie," pp. 2-3.

[46] *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10. Albright, *YGC*, p. 259 argues similarly.

[47] Clapham, p. 27. Cf. Troiani, p. 89 who, as usual (See above Ch. 5, p. 78, n. 52), is indecisive. See also Albright, "Neglected Factors," pp. 239 & 242.

[48] See for example the discussion of Diodorus' cosmogony in K & R, p. 33, n. 1 & p. 403, n. 1.

The *chaos* of the cosmogony is "dark as Erebos." Once again, Gen. 1: 2 is significant, as are the Egyptian traditions of Hermopolis. These traditions speak of four pairs of deities united in an ogdoad. Each of the pairs represents a physical fact. The first pair represented the waters, the third pair darkness.[51]

806: 16 ἄπειρα

The ἀήρ and *chaos* were boundless, in extent rather than in time.[52]

---

[49] Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte*. See especially the review of A. D. Nock, *Classical Review*, Vol. 12 (1962), pp. 50-51. Nock writes that Spoerri's proof that Diodorus' cosmogony is a product of the cultural heritage of Diodorus' own time is absolutely convincing.

[50] See Frankfort, *BP*, pp. 253-254. For specific discussions of this aspect of Philo's cosmogony see Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," pp. 55 and 58; Du Mesnil du Buisson, *NE*, pp. 85-86. Cf. Loewenstamm, "Philon," pp. 325-326.

That the cosmogony demythologized accounts of the traditional gods in physical terms may seem odd since Philo opposed those who made stories about gods into physical accounts (805: 6, 813: 5-6). Perhaps Philo was not aware that the cosmogony he presented was doing exactly what he rejected. He may have understood the text in purely scientific terms and may not have recognized its mythological background. A more likely explanation would depart from the Euhemeristic classification of the gods which Philo accepted (see above on 805: 25-806: 10). A Euhemerist's gods were either the forces of nature or deified culture heroes. The physiologizers Philo detested were those who tried to interpret the accounts of the *culture heroes* in physical terms. Philo would therefore not have opposed demythologizing of the type found in the cosmogony. In any case, such demythologizing was an important stage in the passage of the Greeks from a mythical to a rational mentality. See Guthrie, *ITB*, pp. 11-19.

[51] *NDM*, p. 53; Brandon, *Creation Legends*, p. 46.

[52] *Duri dari* of Mesopotamian cosmogony is boundless time and therefore not strictly comparable. See Lambert & Walcot, "Babylonian Theogony," p. 70.

Clapham, pp. 32-34 suggests that *aēr* and *chaos* were boundless in extent and time. This suggestion is due to Clapham's desire to distinguish between ἄπειρα and μὴ ἔχειν πέρας. One should not, however, search for a distinction between the phrases as they

The Greek word makes one think of Anaximander, but the concept can be explained in Near Eastern terms. The earth in Gen. 1: 2 was תהו ובהו, a difficult phrase which has long puzzled commentators.[53] Formlessness of some sort is implied by the context. This would not be an exact equivalent of Philo's ἄπειρα but formlessness and boundlessness are related concepts. A closer parallel is offered by the Hermopolitan traditions mentioned above. The second of the four pairs are Huh and Hauhet who stand for spatial infinity.[54]

806: 17 *Pneuma*

According to Bernays, this *pneuma* is not to be identified with the ἀὴρ πνευματώδη or πνοή of 806: 15, since this *pneuma* can desire its own ἄρχαι while the latter is called τῶν ὅλων ἀρχὴν and seemingly has no ἄρχαι.[55] Appreciation of the difference between the meaning of ἀρχὴν (beginning) in 806: 15 and ἀρχῶν (primary elements) in 806: 18 may remove the difficulty which Bernays noticed, and restore the obvious equivalence of the *pneuma* and the ἀὴρ πνευματώδη or πνοή.

In 806: 18 ἀρχῶν means the sources or constituent elements of the *pneuma*. If one may judge from the depiction of the production of *pneumata* in 806: 30, these sources would be the land and water within the watery chaos.[56] In 806: 15 ἀρχὴν means the beginning of all things, the בראשית of the world. Like the first two verses of Genesis, 806: 15 describes the state of the world at the point at which the author chose to commence his narrative.[57] The author has omitted all the events which precede that point, in our case the production of the ἀὴρ ζοφώδη καὶ πνευματώδη from the land and water of the *chaos*. We would not know of these prior events save for the need to describe the "love" of the *pneuma* for its own ἄρχαι.

---

are in parallelism (see above n. 12). Clapham's suggestion that ἄπειρα may be a subtle hint of sexual innocence is attractive.

[53] See e.g. Cassuto, *Adam*, pp. 11-12; Clapham, pp. 35-42.

[54] Brandon, *Creation Legends*, p. 46.

[55] Bernays *ap*. Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 808, n. 2.

[56] The use of the production of the *pneumata* of 806: 30 to interpret the *archai* of the *pneuma* of 806: 17 is based on the hypothecated unity of the cosmogony and zoogony, discussed above, p. 100.

[57] On Genesis, see Speiser, *Genesis*, pp. 8-13. See also above, n. 34.

If one combines these considerations, the scheme of the cosmogony emerges as follows: (1) the land and water within the dark and turbid watery *chaos*; (2) the production of the *aēr-pnoē-pneuma* from the *chaos*; (3) the desire of that *pneuma* for its own sources and the resultant mixture called Pothos.[58]

Hermopolis, again, is even more significant than Gen. 1: 2. The Hermopolitan ogdoad must somehow include the land (like Philo's *chaos*) since it produces the hillock on which the subsequent acts of the cosmogony take place.[59] Most important of all, the fourth pair of the ogdoad, Amun and Amaunet, stand for the wind.[60] The four Hermopolitan pairs, taken as a whole, are the precise equivalent of the beginning of Philo's cosmogony. They stand for dark infinite waters and land stirred by wind as the active agent, as in Philo.[61]

806: 19 *Pothos*

Pothos, as has been shown, is a combination of land, water, and wind. Figures similar to Pothos are not found in Near Eastern cosmogonies, with the exception of the cosmogony of the Sidonians preserved by Eudemus (in Damascius).[62] This cosmogony is quite similar to Philo's as it begins with ὁμίχλη, "mist" and *Pothos.*[63] These two produce ἀήρ and αὔρα, and from here Damascius (who is reporting Eudemus) goes off into Neo-Platonic speculation. Pothos' appearance in this Sidonian cosmogony can be interpreted in two ways: it either means that such a figure was a traditional part of Phoenician cosmogony (and thus not suggested by Hesiod's *Eros*), or it can mean that both the Sidonian cosmogony and Philo's were borrowing from Greek sources.[64] In the latter case the borrowing must have begun by 350 B.C., since Eudemus worked in the second half of the fourth century.

---

[58] This interpretation is based on the equation of the σύγκρασις and the πλοκή. The equation is justified because the two words are in parallelism to each other. M. Smith has called my attention to the oddity that the mixture of *pneuma* and its sources is called Pothos, rather than the desire for such a mixture.

[59] *NDM*, p. 35; Brandon, *Creation Legends*, pp. 45-46.

[60] Sethe, *Amun*, pp. 90ff.

[61] Brandon, *Creation Legends*, pp. 46-47. Cf. Maspero *ap.* Clemen, p. 35. Less directly relevant to Philo is the beginning of the Enuma Elish which describes the intermingling of Apsu, Tiamat, and Mummu, of the two kinds of waters and the mist or clouds, on which see Jacobsen in Frankfort, *BP*, p. 184. The cosmogony of Mochos, *FGrH* 784 F 4, is also indirectly relevant, as the roles of the winds differ.

[62] *FGrH* 784 F 4. Pothos is responsible for one of the illuminative stupidities in the history of Philonic scholarship. Halevy, excited by the discovery of the Enuma Elish, assumed that it was the key to unlocking the enigmas in Philo. He therefore proposed understanding Pothos as a translation of Hebrew חפץ, which in turn had entered the text as an incorrect transliteration of Apsu. From our vantage point, almost a century after Halevy, this is ridiculous. How will the Ugaritic keys look a century from now? See Halevy, "Pothos et Mot," p. 386.

[63] *FGrH* 784 F 4. In this case the desire is called Pothos. Cf. n. 58.

806: 19 αὐτὸ

This is the reading of the MSS. If correct it must refer to the *pneuma* of line 17, since that is the only useful neuter noun in the preceding phrases. If so the sentence would state either that the wind did not know of the creation of Pothos or of its own creation (i.e. origin), depending on whether one accepts the αὐτοῦ of the MSS. (in 806 : 20) or emends to αὑτοῦ (on which see below).

The context here, seems to indicate a reference to Pothos who has just been produced and declared the source of all subsequent creation. He should therefore now go on to create but will do so incestuously. His incest must be excused by ignorance.[65] Accordingly read αὐτὸς instead of αὐτὸ.

806: 20 αὑτοῦ

This is Eissfeldt's emendation,[66] the MSS. read αὐτοῦ.[67] Since we have emended αὐτὸ to αὐτὸς above, Eissfeldt's emendation is also necessary. Only if Pothos was unaware of his own creation (i.e. origins) will the sentence make sense.

806: 21 *Mōt*

Mōt is produced by the union of Pothos and the wind (taking τοῦ πνεύματος of 806: 20 twice). *Mōt* is thus the offspring of a second case of incest. In physical terms, Pothos was a mixture of *chaos* (land and water) and wind. Pothos' union with the wind adds more *pneuma* to the mixture, which was now called *Mōt*. This agrees with the description of *Mōt* in 806: 21-22 as either mud or the putrefaction of a watery mixture.

---

[64] Clapham, pp. 47-48, prefers the former conclusion. For a fuller discussion of Clapham's interpretation of Pothos see the Appendix to this chapter, pp. 132-133.

[65] Cf. Lot in Genesis. The incest which must be excused is that of Pothos with the winds rather than the prior case of incest of the wind with its own *archai* which produced Pothos. The first case of incest was presented without apology so there is no need now to go back and apologize for it.

[66] See the critical apparatus *ad loc.* in Mras, *Praeparatio Evangelica.*

[67] *Ibid.*

Philo's *Mōt* has been an enigma to generations of scholars,[68] as he seemingly appeared nowhere but in Philo.[69] Even the Ugaritic god Mot seemed irrelevant as he was the god of death, whose voracious appetite (49: II: 21) inspired Isa. 5: 14, and who appeared with his proper functions in 812: 9-11 as *Mouth*.[70] Pope, in his commentary on Job, has the merit of finally resolving this enigma. The Ugaritic god is lord of the underworld. His domain is described in a difficult passage of the epics (51 : VIII : 1ff.) as filthy, slushy, and putrescent. As Pope notes, this is a perfect equivalent of Philo's description of *Mōt* as mud, or the putrefaction of a watery mixture.[71]

Pope's interpretation is significant for several reasons. The Ugaritic god now appears twice in Philo, once, in the cosmogony as *Mōt*, and again as *Mouth*. This difference of vocalization further supports the arguments presented above for concluding that the cosmogony comes from a different source than the rest of the fragments.[72] Even more significant, however, is the gap between the Ugaritic epics and Philo implicit in Pope's interpretation.[73] *Mōt* of the cosmogony has none of the functions of his Ugaritic equivalent. The name of the Ugaritic god has been used by Philo's source to stand for the physical description of that god's residence, as a name for mud. As in the case of El, above, considerable demythologizing has intervened between the cosmogony and Ugarit.

---

[68] See Orelli, p. 10, n. 4 and Cook, *Zeus*, Vol. 2, Part 2, p. 1038. See also Troiani, p. 81.

[69] Cook was tempted to introduce *Mōt* into the cosmogony of the Sidonians by emending Ὦτος in that text to Μῶτον, our *Mōt*. See Cook, *Zeus*, Vol. 2, Part 2, pp. 1036-1037.

[70] Cf. Dussaud, *Découvertes*, p. 70.

[71] Pope, *Job*, pp. 73-74. Cf. Ginsberg, *ANET*, p. 134. If Held, "Pits and Pitfalls," pp. 188-190 is correct, the notion of the watery nature of the nether world would have to be abandoned. Mot's abode would still be low, but not necessarily miry. The argument developed above would therefore need modification.

[72] Cf. Troiani p. 81.

[73] Pope did not see these implications and sees the Ugaritic passage as further evidence "rehabilitating" Philo's claims.

Ugaritic Mot does not seem to have any cosmogonic functions in the known texts. Mud, however, does have cosmogonic functions in other Near Eastern traditions. In Babylonia, Lahmu and Lahamu, who represent silt, are the first offspring of the intermingling of Apsu, Tiamat and Mummu.[74] All the Egyptian traditions, including that of Hermopolis, agree that the emergence of the primeval hillock from the waters of the *Noun* is the first stage in the creation of the world.[75] The notion of animal life arising from mud looks suspicious, as this was a theory of Greek science.[76] More suspicious is the fact that putrefaction and mud as the material of spontaneous generation were alternative Greek theories, just as in Philo.[77] However the experience of seeing life seemingly spontaneously emerge from the mud was common, particularly in Egypt.[78]

806: 23 ἦν

What is the subject of ἦν, *Mōt* or ζῷα? If *Mōt* is the subject he is identified with the insensate animals. If *Mōt* is not the subject the discussion of the animals (both insensate and intellectual) is a new point, of which the connection with *Mōt* is not indicated explicitly. The context indicates that the latter alternative is preferable. *Mōt* is a putrefaction or mud. Mud or putrefaction often were believed to produce life spontaneously, as was mentioned above. *Mōt* should therefore not be identified with the ζῷα. The ζῷα are the subject of ἦν, and the reader was expected to understand that they arose somehow from *Mōt*.

806:23-24 αἴσθησιν, νοερά

Although the usual translation for these words are used, "sensate" and "intellectual," the usual meanings are somewhat difficult. Plato established the distinction between the sensible and intellectual realms and this contrast guided usage.[79] Yet this distinction is not behind the statement that there were animals which had no αἴσθησις from which there arose animals which were νοερά. If the usual contrast were intended, the text should state that there were sensate animals from which there arose intellectual animals, or that there were insensate animals from which there arose sensate animals. Finally, the living beings characterized as intellectual are called "watchers of heaven;" their capacity is seemingly sensory.

---

[74] See note 61 and Jacobsen in Frankfort, *BP*, p. 185. Mud in the Enuma Elish is produced in a manner analogous to that of the cosmogony. Cf. Williams, p. 37 who sees "little or no similarity between Sanchuniathon's cosmogony and the Akkadian account of creation."

[75] *NDM*, pp. 71-72 and text 29.

[76] See Guthrie, *ITB*, pp. 29-45.

[77] *Ibid.*

[78] See Wilson, in Frankfort, *BP*, pp. 59-60.

806: 24 ἐκλήθη ζοφασημίν

The *Zophasēmin* are the intellectual animals, somehow connected with the origin of male and female animal life (807: 3-5). Philo translates the word as οὐρανοῦ κατόπται. The Greek translation indicates that in spite of the fact that Greek Zeta is not the usual transliteration for Hebrew and Phoenician *ṣ*,[80] and in spite of the possible inaccuracy of the vocalization preserved by the MSS.,[81] *Zophasēmin* must be a transliteration of צופי שמים. Both צופי שמים and οὐρανοῦ κατόπται are ambiguous: they can either mean observers of heaven (on earth), or heavenly observers (in heaven). Are Philo's *Zophasēmin* on earth looking up, or in heaven looking down? Certainty is impossible, but I believe that the *Zophasēmin* of the cosmogony (as it stands) were on earth. The stars and planets, with which the Zophasemin would be somehow associated if they were in heaven, are not brought into existence until after the mention of the *Zophasēmin* (806: 26). This, however, does not exclude the possibility that in some earlier version of the cosmogony the *Zophasēmin* were in heaven (see below).

Figures with names similar to that of the *Zophasēmin* appear in the Jewish legends of the fallen angels, particularly as found in the Book of Enoch. One of the names for the fallen angels is the ἐγρήγοροι, the "watchers;" or in fuller form, the ἐγρήγοροι τῆς οὐρανοῦ, which can be translated the "watchers of heaven,"[82] though it strictly means the "wakeful ones of heaven," and its Hebrew equivalent is not צופי

---

[79] See LSJ s.v. *aisthētos*.

[80] Movers, Vol. 1, p. 135.

[81] Clemen, p. 19.

[82] Enoch 1: 5 and 12: 4. The "Watchers" in Enoch can also be the Archangels or good angels.

but עירי.[83] Nevertheless the similarity of the names may not be accidental; for as Spiegel has shown, the Jewish legends of the fallen angels contain much debased Canaanite mythology.[84] There could have been some gods of Canaanite mythology called "watchers" or "wakeful ones of heaven." As the fallen angels were often associated with the planetary angels these Canaanite gods might have been associated with the planets. Jewish legend made these gods angels, but Philo's cosmogony, in its typical fashion made them animals, perhaps on earth (as opposed to the gods' original location in heaven).[85]

806: 25 ἀνεπλάσθη

The discussion of the various kinds of animals intervenes between the mention of *Mōt* in 806: 21 and 806: 26. The subject of ἀνεπλάσθη is therefore not clear. If *Mōt* is to be indentified with the צופי שמים there is no problem. If he is not, the subject may be either *Mōt* or the צופי שמים or both. If as suggested above, *Mōt* is conceived as the mass of putrefaction from which the insensate and intellectual animals emerge, both *Mōt* and the animals can be the subjects.[86]

The cosmogonic traditions of Hermopolis, which agree almost exactly with the beginning of Philo's cosmogony, strongly suggest that *Mōt* must somehow be at least one of the subjects of the verb, that is must be part of the egg-shaped whole. The next sentence in the cosmogony mentions *Mōt*, the sun, moon, stars, and great luminous bodies. As will become clearer in the commentary on that sentence, the only philologically feasible interpretations of the relationship between *Mōt* and these heavenly bodies all connect *Mōt* with their emergence, or origin. Now the traditions of Hermopolis speak of the birth of the solar demiurge from an egg.[87] Since the cosmogonies of Hermopolis and Philo are so close to each other, it seems reasonable to make *Mōt* one of the subjects of ἀνεπλάσθη, part of the "*Lichtei*," or egg from which the heavenly luminaries are born.[88]

---

[83] See Dan. 4: 10 LXX (TH.).

[84] Spiegel, "NDJ," pp. 337-355.

[85] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 57 also realized that the *Zophasēmin* must have originally been gods, but he did not see the connection with the Jewish legends. See also Troiani, p. 85. On the fallen angels as planetary angels see Bousset, *Hauptprobleme*, pp. 52-54.

[86] Williams, p. 82 makes the *Zophasēmin* alone egg-shaped. Cf. Ewald p. 37 and Bunsen Vol. 5, p. 810, n. 3 who reorganized the text to make *Mōt* the subject of the verb.

806: 26 ἐξέλαμψε-μεγάλα

This sentence, which reads like Greek poetry,[89] is also one of the most crucial and enigmatic for the meaning of the cosmogony. *Mōt*, which is indeclinable, could be, as far as form goes, either the subject or object of the verb. However, since ἔκλαμπω can only take a cognate accusative,[90] (as in the sentence ὁ πατὴρ ἐξέλαμψε τὸν υἱὸν ... ὥσπερ ... ὁ ἥλιος τὸ ... ἀπαύγασμα, "the father shone forth the son ... like the sun ... its rays),[91] *Mōt* cannot here be the object, nor would it make sense as a cognate accusative. Therefore it must be, together with the heavenly bodies, one of the multiple subjects of the verb.[92] The emphasis is on the first of the subjects, on *Mōt*, and the sentence should be translated, "And *Mōt* shone forth (together with) the sun and moon, the stars and the great luminous bodies."[93] The agenda now includes the origin of the heavenly luminaries.

This meaning, however, is not very satisfying, particularly in view of the Egyptian texts cited above which suggest that the sun should be born from the egg-shaped *Mōt*. Accordingly an attractive emendation of this passage was suggested by Ewald:[94] ἐξέλαμψεν ἐκ τοῦ Μώτ ..., the sun and moon burst forth into light from *Mōt*.

---

[87] *NDM*, p. 61, text 19 & 20. Brandon, *Creation Legends*, pp. 44-45.

[88] The term *Lichtei* was suggested by Lukas in his "Das Ei," pp. 231-233 as part of an attempt to distinguish the various aspects of the egg in ancient and modern cosmogonies. The egg in the cosmogony of Mochos, *FGrH* 784 F 4, is a *Weltei* in Lukas' terminology: heaven and earth result when it splits. Cf. Eliade, *ap. NDM*, p. 480.

[89] The meter seems to be (–) ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – // – ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ – ⏑ // – ⏑ – ⏑⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑. The translator of the Phoenician poem seems to have rendered it as Greek poetry.

[90] See LSJ s.v.

[91] Cyr. *Thes.* 6 (5^1.47A).

[92] On multiple subjects of a singular verb see Moulton & Turner, *NT Greek*, Vol. 3, pp. 313-314.

[93] Schwabl, "Weltschöpfung," col. 1495 adopts this translation.

[94] Ewald, p. 37. Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 56 translates as if he made the same emendation, but says nothing of making it. Clapham, p. 23 translates similarly, but defends the lack of a preposition, based on Xen. *Mem.* 3,5,25: προκέται τῆς χώρας ἡμῶν ὄρα μεγάλα, "in the front of our land there lie great mountains." According to

Another emendation can be suggested which does less violence to the text. The verb ἐκλαμπω can be used with a cognate accusative, as was mentioned above. The sun and other celestial luminaries can be cognate accusatives of the verb and all that is necessary to make them accusatives is to change the case endings of ἥλιος and σελήνη.[95] The sentence should then be translated, "And *Mōt* blazed forth the sun and the moon, the stars and the great luminous bodies." This emendation retains the connection between *Mōt* and the heavenly bodies suggested by the Hermopolitan traditions. It is also easy to explain how the error entered the MSS. traditions; case endings were often abbreviated in ancient and medieval MSS and could thus be readily confused.[96] I have adopted the emendation to accusatives for all these reasons.

806: 29 ἀέρος

In the set phrase ἀήρ ζοφώδης of 806: 15, ἀήρ was rendered as "mist." The usual post-Hesiodic meaning is preferable here—air.

806 : 28-807 : 3 καὶ-ἀστραπαί

Meteorological phenomena are explained in these sentences in "scientific" terms, that is as natural processes. Rain results when water, evaporated by the sun from the land and sea, condenses in the clouds and falls back to earth. Thunder occurs when the waters evaporated from the earth meet each other again in the air (presumably as clouds) and crash. It is difficult to account for these explanations of rain and thunder in Near Eastern terms. The Babylonians did not explain meteorological phenomena scientifically.[97] When Baal goes to

---

Clapham, the Xenophon passage shows a pattern of "an intransitive verb compounded with a preposition taking the genitive, a genitive without the preposition, then the subject." Clapham, p. 23, n. 8. The pattern of the Xenophon passage is exactly the same as that in ours; as an extra preposition is unnecessary in Xenophon, so is it in Philo. I have not adopted Clapham's suggestion because this pattern is only valid when attested, and is not attested for ἐκλαμπεῖν; only cognate accusatives are attested for this verb.

[95] In the context of his own reorganization of the text Bernays, *ap.* Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 810, n. 4, proposed the emendation to accusatives.

[96] See Devreese, *Manuscrites Grecs*, pp. 36-46.

[97] See Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien*, Vol. 2, p. 65 and pp. 381-382. For Egypt see Wilson, in Frankfort, *BP*, p. 90.

the netherworld in the Ugaritic epics he takes the rains with him.[98] Nevertheless, Albright has hinted that scientific meteorology was discovered by Phoenicians,[99] and Eissfeldt has made similar suggestions.[100]

Albright and Eissfeldt's suggestions are difficult to evaluate as neither has fully developed his position. Near Eastern sources, however, seem either silent or hostile to their contention, and their best proof would come from the cosmogony itself which both consider free of Greek influence because of its poetic form. The arguments from the poetic style, however, have been disproven above, and a glance at the Old Testament illustrates the weakeness of Albright and Eissfeldt's position. Several Biblical passages speak of meteorological phenomena, such as Ps. 77: 17ff., or Jer. 10: 13. In all of these YHWH is directly responsible for sending rain or thunder. It might seem that Isa. 55: 10 reflects scientific meteorology, but evaporation—the crucial ingredient in understanding rainfall as a natural process—is not mentioned, and the imagery would be meaningless if YHWH did not control the rains.[101]

If scientific meteorology originated in the Near East it is also odd that these theories appear so late and so casually in post-Biblical Jewish sources. The first instance of such scientific explanation is in

---

[98] See Gordon, *UT*, 67: V: 6ff.

[99] Albright, *YGC*, p. 259.

[100] Eissfeldt, "Kosmogonie," p. 3 and pp. 13-14. Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 57 noticed the scientific meteorology, but he neither discussed it nor used it as a criterion for dating. Cf. above, pp. 107-108.

[101] The verse does reflect the common notion that the water which falls from heaven must get there somehow; but the verse does not specify evaporation as the process. Kimchi's comments on this verse, in which he *adds* his father's opinion that the process is evaporation, confirm this interpretation.

Professor Smith suggested a totally different interpretation of the verse, equally damaging to the notion that it implies rational meteorology. He proposes that ושמה לא ישוב means that the waters *never* return on high at all. Presumably the rain comes from the inexhaustible waters above the firmament.

Whatever the case, it is clear that the prophet conceived of YHWH as controlling rainfall. The rain is YHWH's messenger as the image makes apparent. See Isa. 45: 6-8 and McKenzie, *Second Isaiah*, p. 144.

Rational meteorology may be implied in Eccl. 11: 3, but this can only harm Albright and Eissfeldt's case in view of the accepted opinions as to the date and nature of Ecclesiastes, on which see Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, pp. 494-496.

TB Berachot 59a. Four explanations are given for thunder,[102] in the names of scholars of whom the earliest, Samuel (and possibly Rab),[103] lived about a century after Philo. It would thus appear that "scientific" meteorology reached the Jews only after it had become a commonplace among the Greeks,[104] which would be odd if it had been discovered first by people of the Near East, and particularly by Phoenicians.

To conclude, the "scientific" meteorology of Philo's cosmogony cannot be explained in Ancient Near Eastern terms. It joins the rationalizing or demythologizing tendency on the list of aspects of the cosmogony inexplicable in terms of the Ancient Near East.

807: 5 ἐκινήθη-θῆλυ

After all the lightning and thunder something important should happen. The intellectual animals, having been awakened and frightened, should do something befitting the noisy and terrifying overture. When the text says that "there moved, on land and sea male and female" it implies that the important result was the appearance of sexually differentiated creatures.

How the intellectual animals produced or were responsible for the appearance of male and female is never explicitly stated. Perhaps the *Zophasēmin* gave birth to these new forms of life as a result of fright; childbirth as a result of fright was a common idea, among the Greeks at least.[105] Another possibility is that the *Zophasēmin* were bisexual and split when they were awakened and scared. Bisexual beings, although never in quite the same role, appear in Near Eastern cosmogonies.[106] A final explanation involves the possibility that the *Zophasēmin* may have originally been planetary gods, as was discussed above. Perhaps the planetary gods of Canaanite mythology had some role in creating animal or human life. The planetary *angels* or governors are creators of life in several later Near Eastern traditions.[107] If this explanation is correct perhaps Philo's text would be clearer if one read ἐκινήθη καὶ ἐκτίσθη, rather than ἐκινήθη.

---

[102] The context is a discussion of phenomena for which one should pronounce a blessing. Only thunder is explained rationally. The explanations offered are: (1) clouds in a whirl; (2) clouds pouring water into each other; (3) lightning, hitting a cloud and breaking off pieces of hail; (4) the clouds are like open-mouthed jars. When the wind blows across the openings the noise is thunder. It would be interesting to trace the history and origin of these theories. I am sure that investigation would show that these theories were learned from the Greeks.

[103] The printed editions of the Talmud read "the Rabbis." The Munich MS. reads "Rab." Rab is certainly a possible reading, and if the original was Rab it is easy to see how it became corrupted (רב > רבנן). The only difficulty in reading Rab is that when Rab and Samuel disagree Rab is usually mentioned first, but this passage may be one of the exceptions to this rule. For the reading of the MS. and of the printed versions of the text see Rabbinowicz, *Diqduqei Sofrim*, Vol. 1, p. 334.

[104] See notes 113, 116-118 and Nonnus, *Dion.* 2, 496-507.

[105] See e.g. Hippocrates, *Mul.* 1,25 (Vol. 8, p. 66 Littré).

The origin of animal life in the cosmogony thus occurs in several stages. Some animals existed before the sun and moon blazed forth; others appeared afterwards. This order disturbed Bunsen who proposed moving the first stages of animal life after the account of the origin of the sun and moon.[108] Schwabl, however, correctly saw that the text should not be reorganized, as the comparison with Genesis 1 (where the heavenly luminaries are created after the plants) indicates.[109]

807: 7 Τααύτου

This reference to the works of Taautos = Thoth is particularly interesting in view of the numerous similarities between the cosmogony and the traditions of Hermopolis, the Egyptian city where Thoth was worshipped. Albright and Dornseiff are certainly correct in supposing that the cosmogony is somehow directly dependent on Hermopolis.[110] Such a direct dependence is reasonable, given the extensive history of contact between Phoenicia (Byblos in particular) and Egypt.[111]

---

[106] See *NDM*, pp. 66-67 and Ebeling, *Tod und Leben*, p. 28.

[107] See Bousset, *Hauptprobleme*, pp. 9-58. See also *C.H.* I, 11. The origin of the notion of creation by angels, especially planetary angels, remains one of the perplexing problems in the study of Gnosticism. See Grant, "Etres Intermédiaires," pp. 147-154; Danielou, "Mauvais Gouvernement," pp. 454-456; Pétrement, "Sept Archontes," pp. 469-486. See also below n. 124 for the possibility that the Gnostic notion (and that in Philo's cosmogony if it was ever truly there) may be derived from Plato.

[108] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 810, n. 3.

[109] Schwabl, "Weltschöpfung," col. 1496, n. *

[110] Albright, *YGC*, p. 225; *Id.* "Neglected Factors," pp. 241-242. See also Troiani, pp. 83-85, and Dornseiff, "Altorientalisches in Hesiod," p. 238. Add now Oden, "Philo of Byblos," pp. 124-126.

[111] It should be noted that the similarities to Hermopolitan traditions are no criterion for dating the cosmogony as these traditions were quite long-lived. The Hermopolitan texts cited above, notes 51, 59, 75 and 87 are largely of Ptolemaic date.

The results of the analysis of the cosmogony may be summarized as follows. The ultimate source was Near Eastern and Phoenician, as was suggested by the poetic form. Much of the cosmogony can be explained in Near Eastern terms, yet two aspects are definitely inexplicable in those terms and two other aspects are troubling.

Inexplicable is the "atheism" of the cosmogony (to use Eusebius' term), the absence of the traditional gods, or what I have called the demythologizing tendency:[112] the traditional gods have been replaced by the physical element associated with them. That they have been replaced is proved by the fact that the elements now in their places behave—love, are ignorant—like gods. Also inexplicable is the scientific meteorology.

Two other aspects of the cosmogony, while not inexplicable in Near Eastern terms, are nonetheless troubling and suspicious in those terms. Pothos, as we have seen, is quite unusual as a cosmogonic figure, yet a Sidonian cosmogony dated before 350 B.C. also contains a Pothos. The origins of life are alternatively found in mud or putrefaction. This looks suspiciously Greek, yet the experience of seeing life emerge "spontaneously" from the mud was common in Egypt.

A complete explanation of the nature and date of the source of Philo's cosmogony must explain what was inexplicable and what was troubling in Near Eastern terms. To accomplish this task, we must turn away from the Near East and look elsewhere.

vii

Scientific meteorology is first known among the Ionians. It seems probable that this way of explaining the phenomena was originated by Anaximander in the sixth century B.C.[113] It is certain that the conflict between scientific meteorology and traditional beliefs is attested first in Greece.[114] The Ionians also began rational cosmogony from which the traditional gods were absent.[115] Greek science can therefore account for the two inexplicable aspects of Philo's cosmogony.

---

[112] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," pp. 56-57 calls this characteristic the cosmogony's materialism or Aristotelian manner. He does not, however, see the implications for dating. See n. 50.

[113] See K & R, p. 138.

[114] Examples of this conflict would be the prosecution of Anaxagoras (even though it is not certain exactly why and when he was prosecuted), and the new-fangled notions

Anaximander's description of rainfall has been preserved only by Hippolytus. The MSS. of Hippolytus are all corrupt. Accepting Kahn's emendation Anaximander said : "Rainfall arises from the vapor emitted by the earth under the action of the sun."[116] That is, the sun raises vapors from the lower regions and these vapors condense in the clouds and fall back to the earth as rain. The explanation of rainfall in the cosmogony clearly agrees with Anaximander's.

The cosmogony's account of the production of thunder also has parallels in Greek natural philosophy. Zeno, according to Diogenes Laertius, explained thunder as arising from the rubbing of the clouds.[117] Lucretius offers an explanation which agrees precisely with the cosmogony's.[118] Philo's cosmogony therefore agrees not only in approach but also in detail with Greek science.

Greek cosmogony may also have been responsible for the two troublesome aspects of the cosmogony. Figures like Pothos may have been traditional among the Phoenicians, but Eros in Hesiod and Aristophanes[119] may have inspired the Sidonian and Philonic cosmogonies. The similarity of the position of Eros in Hesiod and Pothos in Philo is particularly impressive. At the very least Greek sources may have caused Phoenicians to emphasize this aspect of their tradition. Similarly, it is difficult to decide whether the origin of life from mud represented Greek influence or was an observation made in the Near East.

Greek science thus explains those aspects of the cosmogony previously inexplicable. The conclusion that the cosmogony was written after the sixth century B.C. and had Greek sources is inescapable. The

---

of Socrates in Aristophanes' *Clouds*, esp. lines 364-426; 816-830. I confess to being puzzled why the reaction to scientific meteorology did not occur until over a century after these ideas were first proposed.

[115] See Jaeger, *Theology*, pp. 22-37.

[116] ὑετοὺς δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἀτμίδος τῆς ἐκ γῆς ὑφ᾽ ἡλίου ἀναδιδομένης. Kahn, *Anaximander*, pp. 63-64.

[117] D.L. 7, 154 = SVF 1, frag. 117.

[118] Lucretius 6, 96-98 : *concurrunt subline volantes / aetheriae nubes.*

[119] Hesiod, *Theog*, 120, Aristophanes, *Av*. 696.

cosmogony thus represents the impact of Greek rationalism on native Phoenician speculation. Philo's cosmogony is a product of a native Phoenician tradition brought up to date and into harmony with the best science of the day—Greek science.[120]

This conclusion has important consequences for our understanding of the cosmogony. Since it certainly had some Greek sources it may have had others. That is, many aspects of it may have been suggested or reinforced by Greek speculation. It therefore seems useful to briefly indicate the parallels between the cosmogony and Greek sources.

The origin of the world from water goes back to Homer, *Iliad* 14,200f. and 14,244ff. Aristotle (*Met.* A3, 983b6) attributes a similar idea to Thales. Empedocles made water and air two of his four elements (DK B 1, 17ff.). Zeno interpreted the Hesiodic *Chaos* from the verb χέω, and thus understood it as watery (SVF 1, frag. 103).

Philo's misty wind is similar in origin to Anaximenes' ἀήρ, which was an intermediate form of water. The ἀήρ is boundless in both authors (DK A 5). The wind was an active agent in Stoic cosmology, as in Philo. *Pneuma*, for the Stoics, is composed of fire and air, but it has the ability of making the other two elements—earth and water—cohesive by intermingling completely with them. *Pneuma* is thus responsible for the physical qualities of nature.[121]

Mōt, either mud or the putrefaction of a watery mixture, is the seed of all things. Anaximander believed that animal life originated in moisture, while Empedocles thought that "all things that come-to-be and grow are earth and water." Lucretius states that animals are born from the earth which has been fertilized by rain, and the cosmogony in Diodorus 1,7,1-7, has life originating from fermenting pustules of clay. Spontaneous generation and putrefaction were thus two alternative theories among the Greeks.[122]

Mōt was egg-shaped and blazed forth the heavenly luminaries. The cosmogony in Aristophanes, *Aves* 693ff. (which is a parody), has similar ideas. Even closer is the Orphic cosmogony according to the version of Hieronymus and Hellanicus (of which the sources of Aristophanes' parody may have been sources.)[123]

---

[120] In this sense the Jewish and Phoenician Philos share more than a name.

[121] See SVF Vol. 2, Frags. 439, 440, and 449, and Sambursky, *Physics of the Stoics*, p. 13.

[122] See Ananimander DK A 30; Empedocles DK B 29; Lucretius 5, 796-798; 806ff. On the cosmogony of Diodorus see Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte*, p. 97. On putrefaction and mud as alternative theories see Guthrie *ITB*, pp. 29-45.

The *Zophasemin* may be bisexual, as are many monsters in the Orphic texts just mentioned. Aristophanes' famous speech in Plato, *Symposium* 189Eff. should also be noted. Finally, the idea of creation of life by the planets (or their gods or angels) may be derived from Plato, *Timaeus*, 41A-D.[124]

The cosmogony and the Greek texts are not always saying exactly the same thing, and their differences have not been noted in detail. Nevertheless, the features of the cosmogony mentioned may have been reinforced by these Greek sources, or even, sometimes, derived from them.

viii

The interpretation of the cosmogony attributed to Sanchuniathon and Taautos as a reworking of traditional Phoenician cosmogonic notions under the impact of Greek thought is supported by our knowledge of Oriental speculation during the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Particularly instructive are certain passages in the *Corpus Hermeticum* and Gnostic literature. These passages show that Philo's cosmogony, as interpreted here, was not a unique event, that there were other hellenizing interpretations of traditional material.

The Jewish background of *C.H. III* has often been discussed.[125] Scott, for example, writes : "It is evident ... that the writer of Corp. III knew the Mosaic account of the creation. But he also knew Stoic cosmology; and in this document he has tried to harmonize the one with the other."[126] Scott also noticed several similarities in detail between *C.H. III* and the cosmogony which Philo attributes to Sanchuniathon. However, he rewrote the Philonic and Hermetic texts so completely that his conclusions are of little value.[127]

---

[123] See Damascius, *De Prim. Princ.* 123 *bis*, and Athenagoras, *Pro Christianis* 18, p. 20 (Schwartz). These texts are collected in Kern, *OF*, frags. 54 and 57. See also Williams, pp. 43-44.

[124] It seems remarkable that the significance of this passage for the history of Gnosticism in particular was only recently noticed by Boyancé, "Les Archontes de Platon," pp. 340-356.

[125] See Dodd, *Bible and Greeks*, pp. 212-234 and Nock in Vol. 1 of his edition of *C.H.* p. 43.

[126] Scott, *Hermetica*, Vol. 2, p. 112.

The central assertion of *C.H. III* is that nature is divine (*C.H. III*, 1 & 4). The cosmogonic process begins with a boundless darkness over the face of the abyss and a fine and intelligent wind (III, 1). These things existed in the *chaos* by divine power. A holy light detached itself from the watery substance and the elements condensed; the lighter elements rose and the heavier descended (III, 2). After the creation of the heavens and of the animals comes man. One of his functions is to observe the heavens (III, 3).

The combination of traditional and Greek ideas is apparent. The abyss and wind are Biblical notions, but the fineness and intelligence of the wind, and the description of the separation of the elements are Stoic.[128] *C.H. III* is thus a hellenizing reinterpretation in the sense discussed above.[129] Moreover, while *C.H. III* differs from Philo's cosmogony in important details, most notably in its agenda, it agrees in others. Both texts speak of the primeval waters and wind, and the observation of the heavens is important in both.

One group of Gnostic texts, the cosmogony of the Nicolaitans, is even more strikingly similar to Philo's cosmogony. The Nicolaitan cosmogony is preserved in three versions, by Ps. Tertullian, Epiphanius, and Filastrius.[130] Ps. Tertullian, *Adv. omn haer.* 1,6 writes:

> *hic dicit tenebras in concupiscentia luminis et quidem foeda et obscena fuisse; ex hac permixtione pudor est dicere quae foetida et immunda. sunt et cetera obscena; aeones enim refert quosdam turpitudinis natos et complexus et permixciones exsecrabiles obscenasque coniunctas et quaedam ex ipsis adhuc turpior, natos praeterea daemones et deos et spiritus septem et alia satis sacrilegia pariter et foeda.*

---

[127] *Ibid*, pp. 113-117.

[128] *Ibid.*, pp. 121-125.

[129] A similar case could be made for C.H. 1, but the traditional material being reworked is more difficult to identify, and the similarities to Philo's cosmogony less evident.

[130] I am far from the first person to have noticed these similarities. See Bousset, *Hauptprobleme*, pp. 103ff.

> This fellow says that the darkness was desirous of the light—indeed an abominable and indecent desire. It is not proper to say which foul and abominable things came from this mixture. There are also other indecencies; for he says certain Aeons were born of infamy, and he reports the cursed and indecent embraces and mixtures which were joined in, and certain things issued from these, but even more shameful. And, besides, he tells how daemons, and gods and seven spirits were born and he relates other things alike sufficiently impious and abominable.[131]

The second account is that of Filastrius (*Haer.* 33, 3ff. p. 18, 8ff. Marx):

> *ante, inquit, erant solum tenebrae et profundum et aqua, atque, ex his divisio facta est in medio et spiritus separavit haec elementa. tunc ergo tenebrae inruentes in spiritum genuerunt quattuor aeonas et isti quattuor genuerunt alios quattuor aeonas. hoc autem dextra atque sinistra, lux inquit, sunt et tenebrae. quendam etiam concubuisse cum illa muliere et virtute dicunt, de qua nati sunt dii et homines et angeli et septem spiritus daemoniorum.*

> In the beginning, he says, there were only darkness, the deep and water. And out of these a division was made in the middle and the wind separated these elements. Well then, the darkness rushing into the wind begat four Aeons and these four begat four other Aeons. Moreover, he says, in this manner the right and left, light and darkness came into being. They also say that a certain male had intercourse with that female power from which gods, men, angels and the seven spirits of the daemons were born.

The final text is Epiphanius, *Panarion haer.* 25,5ff., p. 272, 19ff. Holl. This version seems to be the most complete and was the source of Filastrius' version:

> σκότος ἦν καὶ βυθὸς καὶ ὕδωρ, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἀνὰ μέσον τούτων διορισμὸν ἐποιήσατο αὐτῶν. τὸ δὲ σκότος ἦν χαλεπαῖνον τε καὶ ἐγκοτοῦν τῷ πνεύματι, ὅπερ σκότος ἀναδραμὸν περιεπλάκη τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐγέννησε. φησίν, τινὰ Μήτραν καλοζμένην, ἥτις γεννηθεῖσα ἐνεκίσσησεν ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ πνεύματι. ἐκ δὲ τῆς Μήτρας προεβλήθησάν τινες τέσσαρες αἰῶνες, ἐκ δὲ τῶν τεσσάρων αἰώνων ἄλλοι δεκατέσσαρες, καὶ γέγονε δεξία τε καὶ ἀριστερά,

---

[131] Latin text from *Corpus Script. Eccles. Lat.*

> φῶς καὶ σκότος. ὕστερον δὲ μετὰ πάντας τούτους προβεβλῆσθαί τινα αἰσχρὸν αἰῶνα, μεμίχθαι δὲ τοῦτον τῇ Μήτρᾳ τῇ ἄνω προδεδηλωμένῃ καὶ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ αἰσχροῦ καὶ τῆς Μήτρας γεγονέναι θεούς τε καὶ ἀγγέλους καὶ δαίμονας καὶ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα.

> Darkness, the deep and water existed. And the wind made a division in the midst of these. But the darkness was complaining and envying the wind. And this darkness, rushing up, embraced the wind and begat, he says, a certain female called Mētra (Womb), who having been born, conceived of the same wind. And from Mētra were brought forth some four Aeons, from the four Aeons another fourteen; and the right and left, light and darkness came into being. But later, after all these, a certain shameful Aeon was brought forth and this Aeon had intercourse with the aforementioned Mētra; and from this shameful Aeon and Mētra were born gods, angels, daemons and the seven spirits.

The scheme of this cosmogony is as follows. Darkness, the deep and water are first elements. *Pneuma*, either composed of these elements or additional to them, divides them. Darkness, the active agent, unites with *pneuma* and *Mētra* (Womb) results. *Mētra* bears four Aeons fathered by the *pneuma* and these four Aeons produced another four (we must accept the reading of Filastrius): right and left, light and darkness. Finally, a shameful Aeon, who was born later, unites with *Mētra* and the gods, angels, the daemons, the seven spirits, and according to Filastrius men, are born.

The similarities between this cosmogony and that which Philo claimed to have translated from Sanchuniathon are numerous and significant. The first elements in the Nicolaitan cosmogony—darkness, the deep and water—are equivalent to the first element in Philo's cosmogony—the dark and turbid *chaos*. The next steps in both cosmogonies are the same. Wind (perhaps produced by the watery elements), unites with the dark element—in Philo it is the dark earth and water of *chaos*, in the Nicolaitans the darkness. In the Nicolaitan cosmogony, according to Epiphanius, the product of the union is called *Mētra*, in Philo *Pothos*. In both cosmogonies the product of the union of the waters and the wind then unites with the wind.[132] According to Philo

---

[132] For the Nicolaitans, Epiphanius is supported against Filastrius (who omits this step) by Ps. Tertullian's indication that there was another "more shameful" (therefore probably incestuous) union here.

Mōt results, according to the Nicolaitans four Aeons. From this point onward the cosmogonies differ. However, both present the same scheme for the first stages of the cosmogonic process, and the motif of incest plays an important role in both.[133] The most significant differences in the early stages are that the wind seems to have an active role in Philo while darkness plays the active role in the Nicolaitan cosmogony, and the function of incest may differ in the two cosmogonies. The function of incest is not clear in Philo, but it must have been proof and cause of the evil nature of the material world for the Gnostic.[134]

The Hermetic and Gnostic texts cited establish a point vital to the inquiry, that Philo's cosmogony as interpreted here was not *sui generis.* Not only do we have Eudemus' report of a similar Phoenician cosmogony from the fourth century B.C. at the latest, but the neighbors of the Phoenicians were also engaged in reinterpreting their traditional doctrines in the light of Greek philosophy. Indeed the results of the efforts of the Phoenicians and their neighbors are remarkably alike. The results seem so similar that it is tempting to suppose that Philo's source was written in its final form at approximately the same time as *C.H. III* and the cosmogony of the Nicolaitans. A date at the very end of the first century B.C. or during the first two centuries A.D. seems proper.[135] This would be close to the time when Philo himself was active.

ix

The Philonic cosmogony, as was previously established, was written with the same techniques as Biblical and Ugaritic poetry. The analysis of the contents has shown that the cosmogony, while based on ancient Phoenician traditions was also influenced by Greek rationalism. Now, Philo claims that he is translating Sanchuniathon, and while we cannot determine whether a text written by Sanchuniathon was translated we may ask whether Philo did *any* translating. That is, thus far in the argument the assumption has been made that the immediate source of the cosmogony was a Phoenician poem. We must now ask whether this assumption was justified. Perhaps the cosmogony was a *de novo* composition in Greek (based of course on traditional Phoenician sources and employing the parallelistic technique).

---

[133] In the version of Epiphanius, the shamefulness of the deeds is not mentioned until the last union, that of the shameful Aeon with *Mētra.* The versions of Ps. Tertullian and Filastrius, however, speak of the monstrosity of the very first stages of the process. Thus both the cosmogony and these Gnostics place the first case of incest at the outset.

[134] See e.g. Jonas, *Gnostic Religion*, pp. 42-44.

[135] For the Hermetica see Nock's comment in Vol. 1 of his edition, p.v. The Gnostic Nicolaitans were known to Irenaeus (130-200 A.D.). They may be the group discussed in Chapter Two of Revelations. The similarities between the cosmogony and the Gnostic texts may have implications for the history of Gnosticism. These implications, however, are beyond the scope of the present work.

In favor of a Phoenician original are the poetic form and the recurrent use of καὶ. On the other hand, Wisdom of Solomon demonstrates the possibility of a work composed in Greek which employs the parallelistic technique; and the excessive use of καὶ is attested in books of the New Testament composed in Greek.[136] Also in favor of a Greek original is the relative simplicity of this hypothesis. We must assume only that a Phoenician familiar with both his native and Greek speculation wrote a cosmogony in Greek in which he employed his traditional poetic technique. A Phoenician original requires the more complex assumption that a Hellenized Phoenician wrote a poem in his native language which embodied the results of his synthesis of Phoenician and Greek ideas. This poem would then have been translated into Greek, perhaps by Philo. But the argument of the relative simplicity of a Greek original is not convincing. Ben Sira is an example of precisely the supposedly more complex assumption : a text influenced by Hellenism, written in the native Semitic language and in the native poetic form, later translated into Greek.[137]

It would therefore seem that the question of the original language of the cosmogony is not answerable and is not very important for an appreciation of its contents.[138] In the absence of decisive evidence to the contrary (such as proof that Philo knew very little Phoenician) there seems to be insufficient reason to doubt Philo's claim of having translated texts from Phoenician to Greek.

---

[136] See Blass and Debrunner, *Grammar of the NT*, paragraph 442, pp. 227-9. See also note 29.

[137] See note 28.

[138] The choice between alternatives has some implications for the explanation of the occasional lack of parallelism in the cosmogony. In an earlier section of this chapter I tentatively concluded that this was due to the abridgements of the translator. Clearly, if the cosmogony was written *de novo* in Greek this conclusion is erroneous. In view of the late date I have assigned to the more proximate source of the cosmogony

X

Much has been written concerning the nature and date of the source of Philo's cosmogony. The conclusions presented here have been reached through a series of steps. The ultimate source was Phoenician. The Phoenician source either knew the cosmogony of Hermopolis or —more likely—knew Phoenician material which had taken over and reshaped important elements of that cosmogony. However, the date of the Phoenician source—whether a document or a tradition—of Philo must not be set solely by the ancient reminiscences it contains but by all the reflections of its style and content in Philo's work. The poetic style eliminates a date in the second millennium B.C. and establishes a date sometime thereafter. The poetic form was an important factor in the conclusion that the cosmogony came from a different source than the rest of the fragments. The contents, in particular the demythologizing tendency and scientific meteorology, date the more proximate source of the cosmogony after the sixth century B.C. They also indicate that the cosmogony must have had some Greek sources. Finally, the comparison with the Hermetica and Gnostic speculations suggest a date in the first centuries A.D.

These conclusions stand in sharp contrast with Porphyry's direct and Philo's indirect dates for Sanchuniathon. Both would place Sanchuniathon, Philo's alleged source, in the second millennium B.C. or in the very early first millennium. The Greco-Roman concerns betrayed by these dates and by the other biographical data concerning Sanchuniathon have aroused suspicion as to the true date of the sources of the information Philo claims to have derived from San-

---

another explanation of the occasional lack of parallelism is possible and should be mentioned. The authors of Wisdom of Solomon and of the Damascus Covenant often lapsed from the use of poetic parallelism. These lapses are part of a pattern, apparent even in Biblical texts, that parallelism is less strictly and consistently used in texts of later date. This pattern may be relevant to the cosmogony. On Wisdom of Solomon and the Damascus Covenant see notes 27 and 29 above.

chuniathon. For the cosmogony at least, these suspicions have been confirmed.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER SIX

Clapham has devoted more effort to a complete analysis of the cosmogony than any other scholar who has studied the fragments. He has produced an interpretation worthy of his efforts, distinguished for its thorough and consistent thought. Above all, Clapham's interpretation has the virtue of attempting to discover a *single cycle* of Canaanite cosmogony which has been reworked in Philo's text; Clapham proposes that virtually all details in Philo's cosmogony are derived from the Ugaritic myth of Baal's wars with Yam (which he understands cosmogonically).

Clapham's interpretation differs radically from mine; the differences include details and conclusions. As was noted (p. 105, n. 33), it would be unreasonable and unfair to treat these differences piecemeal. This Appendix will therefore be devoted to a summary of Clapham's position, followed by a critique.

Clapham's understanding of the Baal-Yam cycle is fundamental to his interpretation. Clapham begins with the hypothesis that Baal is a creator of the cosmogonic sort, and that Baal's wars with Yam may, indeed should, be compared with Marduk's battle with Tiamat in the Enuma Elish.[139] Clapham concedes that Marduk shapes heaven and earth from Tiamat while Baal apparently makes nothing from Yam, but he argues that Baal's victory is nonetheless cosmogonic; Baal has a palace built for himself after his victory (51:V:115-118), and palace building is symbolic of restructuring the world.[140] In addition, Baal's means of defeating Yam are similar to Marduk's: Baal dries Yam with his winds, and splits Yam into heaven and earth.[141] A mopping up of Yam's remaining allies, who are similar to Tiamat's monsters, follows.[142]

Clapham is not alone in his understanding of Baal's wars with Yam.

---

[139] See e.g. Clapham, p. 38, n. 22.

[140] Clapham, pp. 37-38.

[141] Gordon, *UT*, 68:11ff. Clapham, pp. 56-59. See also Job 26: 12-13, Ps. 77: 17-19.

[142] Clapham, pp. 63 & 74. See also Job 26: 5-14.

Fisher sees Baal as a "cosmogonic" creator, and also sees temple building as Baal's decisive creative act.[143] An entire section of Cross' *Canaanite Myth* is based on the same interpretation.[144]

The consistent theme in Clapham's interpretation of Philo will be based on this understanding of Baal's creative acts and role in his wars with Yam. Whenever *pneuma* is active in Philo, Clapham will propose that this is Euhemerization of what was originally the role of Baal. Clapham claims that translating Philo's Euhemeristic account back into mythological terms will clarify many details of the cosmogony. Clapham is so convinced of the accuracy of this approach that he will also argue that when evidence for a particular creative act by Baal is lacking in the more ancient sources one can justifiably hypothesize the existence of such an episode in Canaanite cosmogony on the basis of known Near Eastern sources and Philo of Byblos.

With this background in mind we can proceed to Clapham's analysis of the cosmogony. The first stage, according to Clapham, begins with the already existent ἀήρ and χάος. The former is dark, dense, wind in motion; the latter is heavy, wet, dark, and muddy—much like the stuff of the netherworld.[145] These two, but particularly the *chaos*, are to be compared with the תהו ובהו in Genesis; they are the chaotic indeterminate stuff from which the world will be shaped.[146]

In the next stage, the *pneuma* (which Clapham understands as a new party, *not equal* to the ἀέρα ζοφώδη of 806: 15)[147] lusts incestuously after its own watery origins and produces Pothos. The attack of the winds on the waters is also paralleled in Genesis: Clapham, like many other scholars understands the phrase רוח אלהים מרחפת על פני המים as suggesting a sexual assault.[148] The attack of the winds on the waters is also the central moment of the Baal-Yam cycle.

Clapham insists that Pothos is not borrowed from Hesiodic *erōs*. This conclusion is based on three arguments: (1) Baal of Ugarit assaults the waters, and a figure like Pothos can be discovered in

---

[143] Fisher, "Creation," pp. 316-320.

[144] Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, pp. 91-144.

[145] Clapham, pp. 31-32.

[146] Clapham, pp. 39 & 41-42.

[147] Clapham, p. 43.

[148] Clapham, pp. 46-47.

Ugaritic. In text 62:50 we learn that *arš* and *tnn* are in the sea (*ym*). Clapham proposes that *arš* is the name of a sea monster (like *tnn*), allied with the sea against Baal, and whom Baal must defeat.[149] The proper noun *aršu* he suggests, is derived from the root *ʾrš* and means desire.[150] *Arš*, as god of desire equals Pothos; Ugaritic *arš* is in the sea just as Philo's Pothos was born as a result of the assault of the winds on the waters. (2) Pothos can be found in the Phoenician cosmogony of Eudemus which dates from the second half of the fourth century B.C. (3) If Philo, or his source(s) had borrowed the figure of Pothos from Hesiod, *erōs* would have been borrowed.[151]

Clapham argues that αὐτὸ of 806: 19 refers to *Mōt*, and proposes that the entire phrase αὐτὸ δὲ - ἐγένετο Μώτ (806: 19-21) be rendered: "and (Mot) did not know his own creation, and from (*chaos*') connection with *pneuma* arose *Mōt*."[152] *Mōt*, as Philo says, is "mud," but Philo's *Mōt*, according to Clapham, is not the equivalent of Ugaritic Mot. Rather, Philo's *Mōt* is to be understood on the basis of Hebrew מוט as in Ps. 66 : 9 and Ps. 121 : 3, where it means "quagmire," particularly the quagmire of the netherworld.[153] Philo's *Mōt* is the stuff at the bottom of the cosmos, a part of chaotic primordial matter.[154]

In the next stage of the cosmogony, *Mōt* was ἀνεπλάσθη in the shape of an egg (806: 25ff.). Clapham argues that ἀναπλασόω is to be sharply distinguished from πλασόω. Only the latter means "shape" or "form;" the proper meaning of the former is "*re*shape," or "*re*-mold."[155] *Mōt*, the subject of this verb, was reformed by an active agent into an egg from which the heavenly spheres will be constructed in the following stages. There are thus two stages of activity upon *Mōt* according to Clapham: (1) reforming *Mōt* from its chaotic state into an egg, and (2) fashioning heaven and earth from the egg.

---

[149] It is clear from Gordon, *UT*, 62: 50 that *tnn* is defeated. What is not clear is whether Baal or Anat defeats the *tnn*. See further below pp. 208-209 & p. 138, n. 173.

[150] On the root *ʾrs* see Gordon, *UT*.

[151] Clapham, p. 48.

[152] Clapham, p. 22.

[153] See also Dahood, *Psalms*, *ad loc.*

[154] Clapham, p. 53.

[155] Clapham, pp. 49-50.

Clapham summarizes his understanding of these stages of the cosmogony as follows: *Mōt*, the chaotic primordial stuff, is produced by an attack of the wind on the waters. But *Mōt* must be ordered if it is to become the basis for the cosmos. Some ordering of *Mōt* takes place when it is reformed into the cosmic egg; the ordering is complete when the egg opens and the heavenly spheres are constructed.

The active agent which reformed *Mōt* into the egg is not mentioned by Philo. Clapham believes this difficulty can be readily resolved. The active agent throughout the cosmogony is *pneuma*; therefore it too must have also reshaped *Mōt* into the egg.[156] The mythological episode which was Euhemerized into the formation of the egg can also be discovered according to Clapham. Marduk in the Enuma Elish distends Tiamat with his winds (Tab. IV, 100). There is no Ugaritic parallel to this scene in Baal's wars with Yam (although Clapham believes that Baal does *dry* Yam with his winds).[157] On the basis of the Enuma Elish and Philo, Clapham posits the existence of a Canaanite cosmogonic tradition in which Baal blew up Yam like a balloon; it was this episode which Philo or his source(s) Euhemerized as the reshaping of *Mōt* into an egg.[158]

The active agent which opened the egg is also not mentioned in Philo, but such active agents are known from Phoenician cosmogonies, for example Chousor in Mochos.[159] Clapham's procedure for discovering the active agent which opened the egg is similar to his procedure for discovering the active agent which reformed *Mōt* into the egg. *Pneuma* remains *the* active agent of the cosmogony hence this act must be ascribed to *pneuma*. The Enuma Elish, Ugarit, and certain Biblical passages (See p. 138 n. 175) provide proof for the existence of a Canaanite cosmogonic tradition in which Baal splits Yam to make heaven and earth; this tradition was Euhemerized in Philo.[160] That this is the correct interpretation of the splitting of the egg in Philo is proven for Clapham by the results as described in 806: 25-26: the sun, moon, and stars shine forth.[161]

---

[156] Clapham, p. 59.

[157] Gordon, *UT*, 68: 11ff. See further nn. 141 & 175 of this chapter.

[158] Clapham, p. 59.

[159] *FGrH* 784 F 4.

[160] Clapham, pp. 58-59.

This interpretation complete, Clapham turns to the obscure passage on the various types of animals. Those described as οὐκ ἔχοντα αἴσθησιν are not animals lacking sensory perception, but rather imperceptible animals. They lack αἴσθησις not because they cannot see, but because they cannot *be seen.* They were hidden, like the monsters within Tiamat in the Enuma Elish. In the latter, these gods emerge when Tiamat is split after Marduk's victory;[162] in Philo they are the sun, moon, and heavenly bodies who emerge when *Mōt* is split. Once these astral bodies have emerged, Philo properly calls them νοερά (in contrast to their previously imperceptible state), because the sun, moon, and stars were thought to regulate men and nature, and were often called νοερά.[163]

Clapham's final proof of this interpretation is a passage from Berossus (*FGrH* 680 F 1,7): οὕτως δὲ τῶν ὅλων συνεστηκότων, ἐπανελθόντα Βῆλον σχίσαι τὴν γυναῖκα μέσην, καὶ τὸ μὲν ἥμισυ αὐτῆς ποιῆσαι γῆν, τὸ δὲ ἄλλο ἥμισυ οὐρανόν. καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ζῷα φάνισαι. It is essential for Clapham's understanding of the passage to note that he emends the final word: the MSS, read ἀφανίσαι, which Clapham emends to φάνισαι.[164] On this reading, Berossus describes how the animals within Tiamat *emerged* after she had been split by Marduk. The parallel Clapham proposes between Philo's account of the various types of animals and Babylonian myth is complete.

Clapham does not interpret the meteorological passage (806: 28-807: 9) as a zoogony, but as the climactic scene in the subjugation of chaos by the storm god.[165] The lightning, thunder, and rains are part of the preparations by a storm god for an assault of the sea, the consistent theme of Clapham's interpretation of Philo.[166] The purpose of this campaign is the final punishment of any remaining rebels.[167]

---

[161] Clapham, p. 23.

[162] Clapham, p. 63. He gives no explicit Enuma Elish reference.

[163] Philo Judaeus, *Opif.*, 73. Clapham, pp. 63, 65, & 73.

[164] Clapham, p. 64. He suggests that the extra alpha was introduced by dittography, *Ibid.*, p. 64, n. 53.

[165] Cf. Eusebius' description, 806: 28 and 807: 6.

[166] Clapham, pp. 67-71. See also Isa. 29: 5-6; Ps. 77: 17-19.

[167] Clapham, p. 72.

The punishment of Marduk's remaining enemies is described in the Enuma Elish in Tab. IV: 105-120:

> And the gods her helpers who marched at her side,
> Trembling with terror, turned their backs about,
> In order to save and preserve their lives.
> Tightly encircled, they could not escape.
> He made them captives and he smashed their weapons.
> Thrown into the net, they found themselves ensnared;
> Placed in cells, they were filled with wailing;
> Bearing his wrath, they were imprisoned.
> And the eleven creatures which she had charged with awe,
> The band of demons that marched (...) before her,
> He cast into fetters, their hands (...).
> For all their resistance, he trampled them underfoot
> And Kingu, who had been made chief among them,
> He bound and accounted him to Uggae (the god of Death).[168]

Clapham proposes that the meteorological section is a Euhemeristic description of this stage of the battle. He further believes that the Enuma Elish passage contains a clue to the meaning of the phrase describing the movement of the animals in the earth and sea (807: 5). The final line of the Enuma Elish passage describes how Kingu "was accounted to the god of Death." Clapham interprets this phrase as meaning that Kingu was relegated to the netherworld, there to become one of the demonic powers of death, disease, and chaos: in short, a chthonic deity.[169] The phrase in 807: 5 ἐκινήθη ἔν τε γῇ καὶ θάλλασῃ ἄρρεν καὶ θῆλυ describes a similar punishment. The rebels, enemies of the victorious storm god, are sent to the netherworld; they now move *only* in the land and sea. They can no longer disturb creation. Chaos, Clapham concludes, is utterly destroyed; creation is established.[170]

ii

Clapham and I agree that Philo's cosmogony was produced as the result of considerable demythologizing. We disagree on two main issues: (1) the mythological material which was reworked, and (2) the interpretation of specific passages. More serious is the former disagreement, as Clapham's presentation of the myths behind Philo's text seems the weakest link in his chain of argument.

---

[168] Translation by Speiser, *ANET*, p. 67.
[169] Clapham, p. 72.
[170] Clapham, p. 75.

Clapham's analysis, as we have seen, is based on the idea that whatever is done by *pneuma* in Philo was Baal's role in the pre-Euhemeristic version of these stories. In order to make this proposition tenable Clapham must argue that Baal did indeed have a cosmogonic role in Canaanite religion; he therefore proposes that Baal's wars with Yam in the Ugaritic epics are to be understood cosmogonically. This conclusion, however, has been challenged, most notably by McCarthy.[171] More difficult is the method Clapham adopts for reconstructing the cosmogonic role of Baal. He combines Ugarit, Biblical references, the Enuma Elish, and (when all else fails) hypothetical sources based on what is in Philo. Such a method, based on a combination of sources from different cultures and times is often unavoidable in analyzing the ancient past; we frequently lack sources from one place and time on which to base our analysis. The dangers of this method, however, are clear: firstly, it is circular; secondly, when we make a "timeless cultural stew (of the ancient near east) in which everything from the first cities of Sumer to the arrival of Alexander the Great is muddled together,"[172] the value of such evidence for historical reconstruction is sharply reduced.

Defering for a moment the question of the accuracy of Clapham's reconstruction of the role of Baal, I would suggest that Clapham's entire analysis of Philo's cosmogony suffers from another flaw, perhaps the most serious of all. Philo offers one positive clue to the source of his cosmogony when he says that "all these things were found written in the cosmogony of Taautos (= Thoth, 807: 5)." Thoth was the god of Hermopolis in Egypt, a city whose cosmogonic traditions were well known. Albright and Dornseiff noticed that Philo's cosmogony was remarkably similar to the Hermopolitan cosmogonic traditions, and proposed that Philo's cosmogony is somehow directly dependent on these Hermopolitan traditions. They further argued that such a direct dependence is reasonable given the long and extensive history of contact between Phoenicia and Egypt.[173] Among all the near eastern sources Clapham cites, Hermopolis is never mentioned; the connections with Hermopolis have no place in Clapham's understanding of the text. To resume the gastronomic metaphor above, Clapham's stew has (too?) many ingredients. But the one ingredient which Philo tells us should be present, perhaps the primary ingredient according to Philo, is missing.

---

[171] McCarthy, "Creation," p. 373. See also Loewenstamm, *Exodus*, p. 105.

[172] The phrase comes from Smith, "Present State," p. 31. The context there is a discussion of "archaeological confirmations" of the Bible.

In addition to these general arguments against Clapham, I have reservations about his interpretation of many specific passages. One example will suffice. Clapham suggests that Baal (like Marduk of the Enuma Elish) uses his winds to defeat Yam: "the rushing wind drives underground and dries up the rebellious sea."[174] This conclusion is essential for Clapham. Only thus can he argue that *pneuma's* actions on *Mot* are a Euhemerization of a Baal story. The Ugaritic evidence cited for this conclusion is *UT* 68: 11ff.[175] This text is a scene from Baal's battle(s) with Yam, but one should note that Baal does not use his winds in this encounter. He employs the special clubs given him by *kṯr wḫss*. Thus even if Clapham is correct and Baal was a creator god, Clapham's reconstructed creation myth seems dubious. It is unlikely that this dubious reconstruction is the key to understanding Philo's cosmogony, as Clapham maintains.

The major virtue of Clapham's interpretation emerges, on balance, as its greatest weakness. Clapham attempts a thoroughgoing Ugaritic interpretation of the cosmogony; an attempt for which he is to be lauded, and which he has carried out with intelligence. If I am correct and Clapham's interpretations are faulty, it is not due to Clapham's lack of insight. Rather it is testimony to the fact that Ugarit is not necessarily the best place to look for explanations of all the difficulties in Philo. Philo's own words (e.g. the reference to Taautos in 807: 5) and the simple meaning of Philo's text often indicate that we should look elsewhere than Ugarit. The pan-Ugaritic interpretations—attractive as they are—are too simple to adequately account for the numerous obscurities in Philo, and for the complexity of the question of the number and date of his sources.

---

[173] Above, p. 120.

[174] Clapham, p. 56.

[175] Clapham also cites several Biblical verses in which YHWH has replaced Baal. They are Job 26: 12-13; Ps. 77: 17-19; 74: 13-14; 89: 10-11; 93: 1-4. These verses, however, hardly help prove the point. In Ps. 77: 17-19, for example, the result of the attack on the sea is a torrential downpour, hardly a drying up of the sea.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE DISCOVERERS

i

The fragments to be considered in this chapter begin with cosmogony. The focus quickly changes to narration of the discovery, by pairs of discoverers, of the necessities of civilised human life, from food and fire, to houses, boats, clothing and medicine. The key to understanding these fragments, implicit though not explicitly formulated in Lokkegaard's analysis,[1] is provided by the discussion of Chousor. Philo makes Chousor and his brother(s) humans, the inventors of iron-working and other crafts, while the Ugaritic epics have taught us that Chousor was the craftsman god. Philo, in his characteristically Euhemeristic fashion, has turned a god into a mortal and the sphere of divine activity into the mortal's invention. This analysis suggests that all the inventors and inventions in this section would be described as gods and their functions by a non-Euhemerist. The commentary therefore must try to present the mortal inventors and inventions as they would be conceived by a more traditionally minded, or non-Euhemeristic, Phoenician.[2] The identity of the god lurking behind Philo's mortal inventor must be established and the invention must somehow be connected with that god's functions. Our information about the Phoenician religion is so sparse that this task often cannot be completed.

The structure of the fragments also requires a comment before passing to the texts. The stories of the birth of the first men and of their discoveries follow the cosmogony. While this arrangement may seem obvious and natural, one should remember that this is a typically

---

[1] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 61. Gen. 4: 17ff, as Lokkegaard realized, is a general parallel to this section, as it too is a list of discoverers. See also Loewenstamm, "Philon," p. 326.

[2] See also Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, pp. 56-57.

Hellenistic pattern (of which the best example is the material in the first book of Diodorus Siculus).[3] Philo's fragments fit this pattern so well that suspicion of the validity of his claims, already very high after the analyses of his introduction and cosmogony, is intensified.

ii

Translation of Texts Discussed[4]

(Eusebius)

(807: 19) Then he says:

(Philo)

that from the wind Kolpia and his wife Baau (and that he renders "Night") there were born Aion and Protogonos, mortal men called by these names. Aion discovered the food obtained from trees.(807: 20) The children born of them were called Genos and Genea and they settled Phoenicia. And when there were droughts, they stretched out their hands to heaven, towards the sun. (807: 23) For (he says) they considered him the sole god, the ruler of heaven, calling him Beelsamen, which means to the Phoenicians "Ruler of Heaven," but to the Greeks "Zeus."

(Eusebius)

(807: 26) After this passage he charges the Greeks with an error saying:

(Philo)

It is not without reason that we have explained these things in many different ways, but it is on account of the later varieties of interpretation of the names in the history which [names] the Greeks in their ignorance, misled by the ambiguity of the translation, misunderstood.

---

[3] See Spoerri, *Späthellenistische Berichte*, pp. 34 & 118.

[4] I have argued in Chapter Five that 807: 10-19 is a part of Philo's introduction and should be moved there. The text considered in this chapter accordingly begins with 807: 19. It is difficult to be certain which passages are direct citations of Philo and which are Eusebius' paraphrase: Jacoby and Mras differ radically. I have generally followed Mras.

(Eusebius)

(808: 2) Next he says:

(Philo)

From Genos,[5] the son of Aion and Protogonos, there again were born mortal children whose names were Phos, Pyr and Phlox. (808: 4) These (he says) by rubbing sticks together discovered fire, and they taught its use. And they begot sons who in size and eminence were greater [than their fathers] (808: 5) and whose names were given to the mountain ranges over which they ruled so that the Kassios, the Lebanon, the Anti-Lebanon and the Brathys were called after them. (808: 7) From these (he says) were born Samemroumos who is also [called] Hypsouranios and Ousoos. And (he says), they called themselves after their mothers, since the women of that time united freely with anyone upon whom they chanced.

(Eusebius)

(808: 10) Then he says

(Philo)

[that] Hypsouranios settled Tyre and he invented huts made from reeds, and rushes and papyrus. And he quarreled with his brother Ousoos, who first contrived a covering for the body from skins of the animals he was able to capture. (808: 12) When there were furious rains and winds, the trees in Tyre, rubbing against each other, caught fire, and their wood burned. (808: 14) Ousoos, having taken part of a tree and lopped off the branches, was the first to dare set out to sea. And he consecrated two stelai to Fire and to Wind and poured as a libation to them the blood of the animals he caught. (808: 17) When Hypsouranios and Ousoos died, he says, their survivors consecrated staves to them, worshipped the stelai [of Ousoos], and celebrated yearly

---

[5] Editors of the text have disagreed whether one should read Γένους or γένους. On the former, Pyr, Phos & Phlox were the children of Genos, son of Aion and Protogonos. On the latter, they were the descendants of Aion and Protogonos. Philo's usage, e.g. 808: 27, suggests that the former is preferable.

festivals in their honor. (808: 19) But many years later, from the family of Hypsouranios were born Agreus and Halieus who discovered hunting and fishing, and hunters and fishermen were called after them. (808: 21) From them were born two brothers, the discoverers of iron and of the method of working it. One of these [brothers named] Chousor, composed [magical] formulas and incantations and prophecies; (808: 23) and he was Hephaistos. He also discovered the fishhook and bait and the fishing line and the raft, and was the first of all men to sail. (808: 24) Therefore they also revered him as a deity after his death. And he was also called Zeus Meilichius. Some say that his brothers discovered the use of bricks to make walls. (808: 26) Thereafter from their family two youths were born, one of whom was called Technites and the other Geinos Autochthon. They discovered the mixing of chaff with the clay of bricks and drying them in the sun. (809: 1) Moreover, they discovered roofs. From these were born others one of whom was called Agros, another the Hero of Agros or Agrotes. (809: 2) There is a statue of the latter which is much revered and a shrine drawn by a pair of oxen in Phoenicia. (809: 4) By the Byblians in particular he is called the greatest of the gods. These thought of adding courtyards, enclosures and cellars to houses. They are the ancestors of [ordinary] hunters and those who use dogs in hunting. They are also called Wanderers or Titans. (809: 6) From them were born Amunos and Magos who introduced villages and flocks. (809: 7) From them were born Misor and Sydyk, that is Easily-solved and Just, who discovered the use of salt. From Misor [came] Taautos who devised the alphabetic writing, and whom the Egyptians called Thouth, the Alexandrians Thoth, and the Greeks Hermes. (809: 11) Sydyk fathered the Dioskouroi or Kabeiroi or Korybants or Samothracians. These, he says, were the first to invent a ship. (809: 12) They gave birth to others who discovered herbs, a cure for venomous animal bites, and charms.

iii

807: 19-20 *Kolpia & Baau*

As presented by Eusebius (undoubtedly following Philo), this passage is anthropogony: the union of Kolpia & Baau produces the first mortal humans.[6] Since, however, Eusebius follows Philo and Philo Euhemerizes, the humans are certainly ex-deities and the passage may have originally been theogonic or cosmogonic. That it was so is pretty clearly indicated by the characters in the first part of it.

The attempts to understand Kolpia divide into two groups: Kolpia is either a Greek or Semitic word. Cumberland proposed a Greek interpretation, understanding Kolpia as a wind from a κόλπος, a bay or gulf. This would be supported by the fact that a gulf near Aradus was called ἵερος κόλπος by the ancients. Philo's Kolpia would be a wind from that gulf.[7] The difficulty with this interpretation is that if Kolpia is Greek it should be declined; Philo usually declines all Greek proper names.[8] The Semitic interpretations of Kolpia are therefore more probable.

Bochart proposed that Kolpia was a transliteration of קול פי יה, *vox oris dei*, the voice of the mouth of God. This interpretation, with its obvious allusion to Gen. 1:2, is unlikely as it makes Philo's sources too Biblical to be true.[9]

Lokkegaard has proposed understanding Kolpia as a transliteration of קול פאה, a destructive thunder, or hurricane followed by thunder.[10] This interpretation is quite attractive as פאה is used in Deut. 32: 26 in a context where it must mean destroy or smite to pieces.[11] Furthermore, Baal's *ql* or thunder is described in the Ugaritic epics as smashing the clouds,[12] and thunder appeared above as the cause of the generation of sexually differentiated creatures.

---

[6] So identified by Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, pp. 38-39; see also Troiani, pp. 93-95. Cf. Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," pp. 57-58.

[7] Cumberland, p. 209, based on Steph. Byz. s.v. ἵερος κόλπος.

[8] Greek proper names are, of course, usually declined. Philo's usage with Semitic names varies. Sometimes they are declined: El in the accusative (809: 22) and genitive (810: 18); Ousoos in the accusative (808: 11); Demarous in the dative (811: 10); Baaltis in the dative (812: 12); Astarte in the accusative (812: 3). Other Semitic names are not declined such as Misor & Sydyk (809: 7ff.) or Chousor (808: 22).

[9] Bochart, p. 705. This interpretation was already attacked by Ewald as a relic of earlier ignorance, p. 40, n. 2. Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Etudes*, pp. 38ff. has inexplicably revived it. Troiani, pp. 94-95 is insufficiently skeptical about the validity of Du Mesnil's interpretation.

[10] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 57, n. 2.

[11] See Held, "Additional Pairs," p. 151, n. 31.

[12] Gordon, *UT*, 51: VII: 28. Dr. Held informs me that *bdqt* in this passage means "rifts in the clouds," as is proved by the Akkadian. Since Lokkegaard's proposal makes

The interpretation of Baau is complicated by Philo's statement that her name means night. Bochart, for example, neglected to consider Baau's functions in the passage and only tried to make her name mean night. He suggested that the text should be emended so that her name became Baaut,[13] which he took as a transliteration of Aramaic בת, which means to spend the night, as in Dan. 6: 19.[14]

Lokkegaard attempts a Ugaritic interpretation, proposing that Baau is a transliteration of *Baʿu* or *Baǵu*, which means desire. Baau would thus be an equivalent of Pothos in the cosmogony. One of Baau's names, according to Lokkegaard, would have been Night, which would explain Philo's translation. Finally, according to Lokkegaard, Philo's transliteration shows that the *ǵ* has become an , Philo has the name in its younger form.[15] A minor difficulty with Lokkegaard's interpretation is that Ugaritic *bǵy* and Hebrew בעה mean to request or wish and not to desire.[16] This difficulty is not however insuperable as request and wish are close to desire. More serious is that if Baau's name meant desire why does Philo call her Night?

The best explanation of Baau may be the one suggested by many of the earliest commentators on the fragments. Baau is understood as a transliteration of Hebrew בהו, the wet, dark and formless stuff known from Gen. 1: 2.[17] Again, as in Genesis, Baau is associated with night. This interpretation is admittedly not completely satisfying as the meaning of בהו is dubious.[18] Nevertheless, it seems more con-

---

sense of Kolpia without resorting to emendation, I have not adopted a proposal of Albright's accepted by Clapham, pp. 83-84. Albright and Clapham suggest that Philo's text originally read ΚΟΔΜ = קדם, the wind which dried up the sea in Ex. 14: 21.

[13] Bochart assumes that the text originally read Βάαυτ τοῦτο, and that the first *t* was omitted by haplography.

[14] Bochart, p. 705.

[15] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 58, n. 2.

[16] For Ugaritic *bǵy* see Driver *CML*, p. 164a and Gordon, *UT*, #496, p. 375. Hebrew בעה appears in Isa. 21: 12.

[17] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 814, n. 1 and many others since have proposed this interpretation, I should stress that the connection with Genesis, according to this interpretation, is primarily philological and does not necessitate our assuming that Philo or his sources were familiar with the Bible. The objection to the overly Biblical interpretation of Kolpia noted above is therefore not relevant.

[18] Cf. Orelli, p. 14, n. 13. See also Ch. 6, p. 109, n. 53.

sistent with available knowledge and Philo's words than other interpretations proposed.[19]

It was suggested at the outset that the section under discussion was originally cosmogonic. This suggestion is confirmed by these interpretations of Kolpia and Baau. Kolpia, a wind, and Baau unite to produce Aion and Protogonos (on these two see below). The similarities to the verse cosmogony of the previous chapter, and to first verses of Genesis are obvious.

807: 20 *Aion*

As presented here, Aion and Protogonos are the first mortals; as an expression of the focus of this section on discoveries, we learn that Aion discovered food trees.[20] Philo thus implies that the first humans were vegetarians.[21] While similar notions can be found in the Bible (Gen. 1: 29; 9: 3), hints in the fragments of another Euhemeristic historian, D. Skytobrachion,[22] are more significant: for, as was noted above (pp. 81 f.), there are a number of minor agreements between Philo and the other Euhemeristic historians.

While Aion is firmly part of the history of mankind in its present context, this was certainly not the original context. Greek Aion and its Hebrew-Phoenician equivalent עלם both had important cosmological associations. Greek Aion, having been discussed by Plato (*Timaeus* 37C-38E), was now a creator in philosophical cosmology. Thus in *C.H.* XI Aion is an intermediate in the chain of creators leading down from God.[23] Aion was also associated with the sun,[24] and was alternately understood as the world order.[25]

Among Semites עלם had similar associations.[26] Cross following

---

[19] Another possibility is to correct *Kolpia* to κολπίου, an adjective meaning "of the deep," and take κόλπιος ἄνεμος as the equivalent of רוח תהום. In this event we have רוח, תהום, and בהו as in Genesis, with the wind as the generative force, which it probably was in the Genesis story in its original form.

[20] See D.S. 1,8,1 where food gathering from trees is one of the first human activities.

[21] Clemen, p. 42.

[22] *FGrH* 32 F, 7,56,3 = D.S. 3,56,3.

[23] Nock, "Vision," p. 83.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 84.

[25] See Lackeit, "Aion," col. 66.

[26] The similarities between Greek Aion and Phoenician עלם were first noticed by Montgomery, "The Highest Heaven," pp. 146-150.

Cassuto, has argued that עלם was an epithet of the god El.[27] El is the creator god of Ugaritic myth and this meaning would accordingly make sense in Isa. 40: 28 where אלהי עולם is identified with YHWH and described as ברא קצות הארץ. Cross states but does not emphasize the fact that עלם also appears as the epithet of the sun god. A Ugaritic text, 2008: 7, mentions *špš ʿlm*, and the Azitawada inscription speaks of שמש עלם.[28] This interpretation would be supported by Gen. 21: 33 where YHWH אל עולם is honored by planting trees. The connection of a sun god and trees is obvious. The interpretation might also be supported by Isa. 40: 28 if ברא in that verse is understood as meaning "to see:" the sun god obviously sees to the ends of the earth.[29] Finally, שמש עלם and its transliterations are frequent in magic.[30]

Phoenician עלם and Greek Aion suggest a remarkably similar set of associations. Philo's Aion, standing at the beginning of a cosmogony could well stand for the current world order: the wind Kolpia and Baau produced the world as we know it. When Aion is connected with the discovery of food from trees the solar associations of both Aion and עלם are obviously relevant. The sun is always connected with plant life and אל עולם of Gen. 21: 33 is honored with trees. The sun god of Greek myth also had a famous orchard.[31] Both Greek and Phoenician concepts could therefore have suggested Philo's Aion.[32]

A final confirmation of the cosmogonic nature of the original of these lines is afforded by their similarity to the cosmogony of Mochos, preserved by Damascius. Here Aion = עלם is the product of the union of the wind Kolpia and Baau. In Mochos, Oulomos is the offspring of Aither and Aer, or, in the alternate version, of the winds Lips and Notos.[33] Aion = עלם must have been a traditional figure of Phoenician cosmogony, appearing in translation in Philo, in transliteration in Mochos.

---

[27] See Gordon, *UT*, 76: III: 6-7. On the reading of these lines see Held, "Factitive-Passive," p. 282, n. 68. On עלם = El see Cassuto, "El Olam," p. 287 and Cross, "Yahweh and the Patriarchs," pp. 236-241. See also Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, pp. 16-18.

[28] KAI 26 A III, Line 19.

[29] The verse in Isaiah would thus mean that אלהי עולם sees to the ends of the earth, as the context and comparison with Job 28: 24 suggest. In *BH* ברא was therefore emended to ראה ל. Dr. Held suggests to me that the emendation may be unnecessary, since ברא can mean "to see" in Akkadian, *CAD* Vol. 2, p. 115.

[30] See Höfer, "Semesilam," col. 677; Bonner, *Studies*, p. 187.

[31] See Rose, *Handbook*, p. 216.

[32] Accepting this interpretation, there is no need to consider the implausible equation of Philo's Aion and Protogonos with Ugaritic *d wšr* now known from RS 24.281, line 13. See Moor, "Studies II," p. 314. Cf. Teixidor, "BES 1973," #48, p. 408. Cf. also Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Etudes*, pp. 42-45.

807: 20 *Protogonos*

Protogonos, Philo would have us believe, is the other first mortal human, as his name suggests. Protognos has usually been seen as a translation of Hebrew and Phoenician קדמון,[34] but this has helped little in identifying the deity behind the title or his function. Lokkegaard suggested that Protogonos was the sun, as implied by the context.[35] Nothing in the context, however, suggests any function for Protogonos so his identity remains dubious. Protogonos and Aion are the parents of Genos and Genea (808: 2) The names of both parents are masculine so that one might have been bisexual. Since Aion's name is put first perhaps Protogonos was the bisexual partner. This possibility would be supported by the other legends about the bisexuality of the first men.[36]

---

[33] *FGrH* 784 F 4. The similarities to Mochos also help in determining the provenance of the material presented in this section of the fragments. Several other points in this section suggest a Tyrian provenance (see below) and Mochos may have been Tyrian. See *FGrH* 784 F 3b; Cf. F 6.

The cosmogonic nature of this section of the fragments has been noted by most recent commentators. See Clemen, p. 40; Clapham, pp. 83-114.

[34] See e.g. Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 814, n. 1, and Lagrange, p. 370, n. 2. קדמון is not found in known Phoenician inscriptions, but קדם and קדמת are found. See Harris, *Grammar*, s.v. קדם, p. 143.

Astour, *HS*, pp. 152-153, 155-159 has argued that Philo's Protogonos = קדמון entered Greek myth as Kadmos, god of the sunrise. Clapham's interpretation differs radically. He argues that Protogonos *is not* קדמון, that the only occurence of *protogonos* in the Septuagint is to render בכורה, Micah 7: 1. Clapham, p. 178, n. 31. Clapham therefore suggests that Protogonos and Aion are one and the same: he would read Αἰῶνα ⟨ὄν⟩ καὶ Πρωτογόνον. Philo's Aion = Protogonos, according to Clapham is thus the equivalent of Aion = Oulomos in Mochos, *FGrH* 784 F 4. Clapham, pp. 86-87. I have adopted neither Astour nor Clapham, as their interpretations either excede what the evidence will support, or do extreme and unnecessary violence to the fragments.

[35] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 58.

[36] See Aristophanes' speech in Plato, *Symp.*, 189Eff., and others. See also *Gen. Rabbah*, p. 55 (Theodor-Albeck).

807: 22 *Genos* and *Genea*

These are the children of Aion and Protogonos, as is suggested by their names. The text emphasizes that they were Phoenicians, that they settled Phoenicia, underlining one of Philo's basic concerns: everything important or useful happened first in Phoenicia.

Genos and Genea must be transliterations of some Phoenician names, yet the actual names have not been identified.[37] Lokkegaard is probably correct in concluding that we cannot determine the identity of the gods hiding behind these names.[38]

807: 22-23 αὐχμῶν-ἥλιον

The origins of religion are explained rationalistically: prayer begins at a time of need.[39] The sun is worshipped with raised hands, a detail to be discussed below.

807: 24 βεελσάμην

Philo correctly identifies the Greek equivalent of Beelsamen or Baalshamem (בעל שמם in Phoenician) as Zeus.[40] Baalshamem is the proper god to entreat at a time of drought because he controls the winds and rain.[41] Prayer to Baalshamem at a time of crisis is also appropriate: he is repeatedly characterized in the inscriptions as a god who listens to and answers prayer.[42] The difficulty in the text lies in the identification of this god (and Zeus) with the sun, a difficulty first noticed by Bernays who proposed emending ἥλιον of 807: 24 to Ἡλον, or El.[43] El, he thought, was the proper name of the god, Baalshamem his title. But the Ugaritic epics have shown that El is an independent god, unconnected with the storm god.[44]

---

[37] Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Etudes*, p. 45 suggests that they render דור ודור, but he never explains how the latter got into this part of the fragments.

[38] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 58. See also Clapham, p. 89. Clemen, pp. 42-43 connects Philo's Genos & Genea with the god Genneas known from several inscriptions (IGLS 2954 & 1301), but the connection is tenuous at best and Genneas was probably not a god. See Cumont, "Gennaios," col. 1154; Seyrig & Starcky, "Genneas," pp. 250-257; Schlumberger, "Prétendu Dieu Genneas," pp. 209-222. Cf. Teixidor, "BES 1969," #41, p. 326; "BES 1971," #52, p. 464; "BES 1972," #53, pp. 421-422.

[39] Cf. Josephus, *AJ*, 12, 259.

[40] See the inscription in Cooke, *Textbook*, p. 296, n. 1.

[41] This is clearest from the punishment Baalshamem will send against the treaty breaker in the treaty between Esarhaddon and Baalu of Tyre, line 10. Translation in *ANET Supplement*, p. 98. Cf. Hvidberg-Hansen, "Baal Malage," p. 68 who neglects Baalshamem's role in the Baalu treaty in favor of unfounded speculation that Baalshamem equals Ugaritic El. Most other scholars, e.g. Leglay, *Saturne Africain*, p. 436 and Eissfeldt, "Baalshamin und Jahwe," p. 22 have not been misled and have followed the one certain piece of evidence, the Baalu treaty. For the significance of the identification of Baalshamem and the Tyrian Baal favored by Jezebel see below, Chapter 8, p. 210, n. 189.

Albright believes the text's sources may be Tyrian and may date from the Amarna period when Tyre was closely connected with Akhenaton's family and the sun god was identified with Baalshamem.[45] But it seems unlikely that a short-lived Egyptian religious movement changed Phoenician beliefs and that these beliefs survived to be preserved by Philo. The latter assumption, in particular, runs against much that has been shown concerning the nature and date of Philo's sources, Similarly, it is impossible to suppose with Williams that since βεελσάμην in our passage is accusative, the nominative form might be Βεελσάμης, בעל שמש in Phoenician, the Baal of the Sun.[46] Long after Philo, St. Augustine still knew that Baalshamem was the Lord of Heaven.[47] Philo could not have been so ignorant that having seen Βεελσάμην in his sources he construed it as the accusative of Βεελσάμης. Nor could he have written Βεελσάμην, intending it to be understood as the accusative of Βεελσάμης, without informing his reader of the extremely unusual usage. Βεελσάμην, without any further explanation and identified with Zeus, prayed to at a time of drought, must be Baalshamem.

Oldenburg is equally intent on proving the accuracy and antiquity of the identification of Baalshamem and the sun. He argues that "in the earlier period (at the time of Sanchuniathon) Baalshamem was the sun god."[48] By Philo's time, Baalshamem was identified with Zeus. The sole evidence Oldenburg offers for this conclusion is a bi-lingual Palmyrene inscription from 131 A.D. in which Baalshamem is supposedly identified with Helios.[49] It should be noted, however, that Cooke regards Helios as an erroneous reading, and reads Dios;[50] Dunant also reads Dios.[51] The date of the inscription Oldenburg cites is embarassing enough for his conclusion; that his argument disregards the Baalu treaty,[52] and is based on an incorrect reading seals the case.[53]

---

[42] E.g. KAI 202, line 11 and many others.

[43] Bernays, *ap.* Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 815, n. 1.

[44] See also above, n. 41.

[45] Albright, *YGC*, pp. 229-230. He calls this interpretation "possible." On Tyre and Egypt during the Amarna period see Katzenstein, "Tyre," pp. 115-129.

[46] In the context of a discussion of various semitic words in Philo, Williams discusses the possible implications of the accusative form, p. 31.

[47] Baal = Dominum; Samen = Caelum. See *Quaest. in Hept.* 7,16 (*ad* Jud. 2: 13) = *PL* 34,797.

All attempts to justify the antiquity of Philo's identification thus fail.[54] Baalshamem was a very popular god among the Semites living in the Roman Empire.[55] He was not identified with the sun by ancient Phoenicians. Indeed, Baalshamem and Shamash are clearly distinguished in KAI 259, lines 3-4.[56] The correct solution to the puzzle of Philo's identification of Baalshamem and the sun is most likely Seyrig's: we have here an example (indeed, the earliest attested example) of philosophical solar pantheism.[57] The identification does not go back to Sanchuniathon or any other supposedly ancient source, but should be attributed to Philo himself.[58]

The gesture of raising hands in prayer to the gods is old.[59] That Baalshamem was so worshipped is clear from KAI 202, line 11:

---

[48] Oldenburg, *Conflict*, pp. 93-94.

[49] Cooke, *Textbook*, #122, line 6, pp. 281-282.

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 282.

[51] Dunant, *Sanctuaire de Baalshamin*, *Inscriptions*, #44, p. 55.

[52] See above, n. 41.

[53] See Mulder, "Oldenburg," p. 363.

[54] Cf. Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, p. 7, n. 13.

[55] See Starcky, "Palmyre," col. 1097.

[56] See Teixidor, "BES 1970," #82, p. 374 and "BES 1974," #52, p. 308.

[57] Seyrig, "AS 93," p. 111. See also Seyrig, "AS 95," pp. 337-339; 340-360. Seyrig there proves that there was little worship of the sun by Phoenicians or Syrians. Those passages such as ours or Tacitus *Hist.* 3,24-25 which speak of solar worship are of later date and are due to the disposition towards astrology in the Roman Empire. See also Troiani, pp. 98-99. Cf. Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 54 and Cumont, "Deux Autels," pp. 163-168.

[58] See Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Ancien Dieu," p. 24; "Zeus Demarous," p. 556. See also Teixidor, *The Pagan God*, pp. 26-28 & 47.

[59] See Ross, "Prophecy," p. 3.

ואשא ידי אל בעלש[מי]ן.[60] Evidence, as collected by Cumont,[61] shows that the sun was thus worshipped in Philo's day.[62]

807: 26-808: 2 μετὰ-μεταφράσεως

In the full text of the *Phoenician History* Philo must have discussed the opinions of numerous other scholars, especially Greeks who he believed to have been misled by their ignorance of Phoenician.[63] In the fragments as preserved we have little to help identify these opponents, by name.[64] There is also little extensive discussion of specific interpretations offered by these opponents, but rejected by Philo.

808: 3 Φῶς, Πῦρ, Φλόξ

These are the usual Greek words meaning light, fire, and flame. Scholars have disagreed whether they were fictions made up to suit their inventions,[65] or three Phoenician gods.[66] On the principle established at the beginning of the chapter the latter is preferable. Lokkegaard attempted to identify these gods with figures known from Ugaritic epics. While his identifications may not be wholly accurate, the approach is probably correct. He identifies Φῶς with Ugaritic *ar*. *Ar*, however, is only known from the place name *Bt Ar* and there is no proof that a god of fire had that name.[67] He also suggests that Πῦρ is Ugaritic *nr* of text 17.10. But that text reads *wnr* and there is no reason to believe that the text must mean "and *Nr*," and that *nr* is a divine name. The third identification, that of Φλόξ with Ugaritic *išt*,[68] is apt. *Išt* is a goddess of fire.[69]

---

[60] See Teixidor, "BES 1971," #115, pp. 477-478. See also Clapham, p. 92.

[61] See Cumont, "Cultes Solaires," pp. 386-392. The gesture of raising one hand is of course better known, but Philo seems to be describing raising two hands.

[62] Cf. Yadin, *Hazor*, Vol. 1, p. 89 for the famous stele showing two hands raised to the moon god.

[63] See 805: 16-22.

[64] But see Chapter Five, pp. 75-77 and Chapter Ten, pp. 255-259. Cf. Clapham, pp. 79-80.

[65] E.g. Renan, p. 261 and Eissfeldt, *T. und S.* p. 20.

[66] E.g. Clemen, p. 41 and Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," pp. 58-59.

[67] See Gordon, *UT*, #324, p. 365. Cf. Troiani, p. 102.

[68] Ugaritic *išt* appears in Gordon, *UT*, ʿnt : III : 43.

[69] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," pp. 58-59.

P.D. Miller has accepted Lokkegaard's principle, but offered different identifications which seem more plausible. Miller suggests that there were three Canaanite gods of fire who were transformed into Philo's Πῦρ, Φῶς, and Φλόξ. The first two were *išt* and *ḏbb* known from Ugarit.[70] The third may be *lhṭ* who can be found in Ps. 104:4, particularly if one reads אש ולהט.[71] On both Lokkegaard and Miller's interpretations, the connection of the three kinds of fire with the mountain chains is obscure.

808: 4-7 υἱοὺς-Βραθύ

As has long been recognized, the story told in these lines is very similar to the Jewish legends of the fallen angels and to the account in Nonnus, *Dionysiaca*, Bk. 40.[72] Philo's story must first be understood independently. He tells of four mortal giants, greater in size than their fathers,[73] who ruled mountains to which they gave their names. As Eissfeldt saw, a non-Euhemerist would probably have spoken of the four Baals of these mountains.[74] Indeed, evidence is not hard to find for the worship of the Baals of at least three of four mountains Philo mentions.

Zeus Kassios, the god of the mountain in Hellenistic times, is apparently the equivalent of *bʿl ṣpn* known from Ugaritic,[75] the Baalu treaty,[76] and Phoenician inscriptions.[77] He was worshipped in much of the eastern Mediterranean.[78] Seleucus I (died 281 B.C.) offered a sacrifice to him, and an undated Greek inscription found on Mt. Kassios itself was probably dedicated to him.[79]

---

[70] Gordon, *UT*, nt: III: 43. *Išt* is parallel to *ḏbb*. On the meaning of the latter term cf. Held, "Additional Pairs," p. 146, n. 38. Miller, "Fire," p. 258.

[71] Miller, "Fire," p. 258, n. 9.

[72] The similarity to Jewish stories was first noticed by Orelli, p. 17, n. 24. The parallels with Nonnus were first noticed by Eissfeldt, *RS*, p. 133.

[73] The Greek phrase in Philo is derived from that in Homer *Il.* 1, 404.

[74] Eissfeldt, "Tabor," p. 16.

[75] Gordon, *UT*, #2185, p. 475.

[76] Baalu treaty, line 10, *ANET Supplement*, p. 98.

[77] E.g., KAI 50, lines 2-3. See the comments in KAI *ad loc.*

[78] Eissfeldt, *Baal Zaphon*, pp. 30-48.

[79] IGLS 1226. For Seleucus' sacrifice see Malalas, *Chronicon*, 8,199 = *PG* 97,311. See also Moor, "Studies II," p. 306 and Teixidor, *The Pagan God*, p. 33. For Mt. Kassios in the Typhon myth see Apollodorus, *Bib.* 1,6,3.

Recently discovered Ugaritic texts have complicated our understanding of Philo's reference; for in addition to *b῾l ṣpn*, we now know of the existence of another different god, *il ṣpn*.[80] To which of the two did Philo refer? Certainty is impossible, but since *il ṣpn* seems to have been the divine mountain itself, while Philo was more interested in the giants, I think he intended to refer to *b῾l ṣpn*. Moreover, the cult of *b῾l ṣpn* = Zeus Kassios continued down to Philo's day.

Baal Lebanon is somewhat less known and may have been less widely worshipped. We know the god from CIS I,5 = KAI 31 where he is honored by the governor of *Qrtḥdšt*. The Baal of Anti-Lebanon is the Baal of Mt. Siryon or Hermon, mentioned in Jud. 3:3.[81] Eusebius, *Onomasticon*, p. 20 (Klosterman) mentions that the pagans of his day still worshipped at Mt. Hermon.

Mt. Brathy has been an enigma to commentators over the centuries. Orelli, for example, writes: "I have searched for this name in vain in the geographical writers."[82] Bunsen says that Brathy can "be found nowhere."[83] Two solutions predominate the discussion, neither of which is wholly satisfying. Lagrange· suggested that Brathy was intended by Philo not as the name of the mountain but as the Semitic-Greek word meaning Cypress. Lipinski would support this conclusion with the observation that in cuneiform sources the Lebanon and Hermon were known as the cypress and cedar mountains respectively.[84] Philo's replacement of the name of the mountain with the tree would thus be plausible.

The proper name of the Brathy = Cypress mountain, according to Lagrange is the Amanus.[85] Albright, Peckham, and others have been tempted to complete Lagrange's thesis and to conclude that Philo was referring to the god a non-Euhemerist would have called בעל חמן,

---

[80] See Pope-Tigay, "Description," p. 123. See also Lipinski, "El's Abode," pp. 58-64; Teixidor, "BES 1973," #51, p. 408.

[81] See Deut. 3: 9 and Eissfeldt, "Tabor," p. 34.

[82] Orelli, p. 16, n. 2.

[83] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 817, n. 4.

[84] See Lipinski, "El's Abode," p. 24.

[85] Lagrange, p. 371.

known from KAI 24 and many Punic inscriptions.[86] בעל חמן would mean "Lord of the Amanus." This explanation of Philo's Brathy, while appealing, thus becomes inevitably interconnected with the complex question of the meaning of בעל חמן, and while considering that god "Lord of the Amanus" is attractive it strikes me as implausible. Leglay noted the basic difficulty: בעל חמן was very popular among Phoenician settlers in Africa. Yet if his name meant "Lord of the Amanus," it seems unlikely that a god associated with a specific place so far away from Phoenician Africa should have continued to have such great appeal.[87] Leglay's own proposal for the meaning of בעל חמן is not superior to the one he rejects, but the meaning of the obscure name of this god need not detain us.[88] Philo's Brathy is unlikely to stand for the Baal of the Amanus = בעל חמן.

The second solution, first proposed by Bunsen, supposes that Brathy is a scribal error for Mt. Tabor.[89] Some scribe's original read Θαβυρ, which he confused and metathesized into Brathy. Perhaps the scribe was confused because Philo had not written Ἰταβύριον, the usual name for Mt. Tabor in Greek.[90] Mt. Tabor fits the context quite well, since there is some Biblical evidence for the worship of Baal Tabor.[91] Moreover, the geographical sequence now makes sense: from Zaphon in the north through Lebanon and Hermon, to Mt. Tabor in the south. This explanation requires our assuming that a scribe accidentally corrupted a perfectly intelligible reference to Mt. Tabor and thus produced the enigmatic Brathy. But such accidental corruptions, especially of proper names, are common in ancient MSS.[92]

---

[86] Albright, "Clemen," pp. 211-212; Peckham, *Development*, p. 14, n. 6; Mowan, "Quattuor Montes," p. 16; Lipinski, "El's Abode," p. 59.

[87] Leglay, *Saturne Africain*, p. 440.

[88] *Ibid.*, p. 441. Leglay suggests that Baal *ḥmn* is the Lord of the altar (heaped with sacrifices), based on the meaning of חמן as explained by Ingholt (see above, Chapter Five, p. 78 nn. 50 & 51). Since Ingholt's interpretation of חמן has been corrected by Milik, *Dedicaces*, pp. 305-306, Leglay's suggestion falls with it.

[89] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 817, n. 4.

[90] This interpretation has been widely accepted. See Eissfeldt, "Tabor," p. 29; Clemen, pp. 44-45; Troiani, pp. 103-104.

[91] Hos. 5: 1 and Deut. 33: 18-19. See also Eissfeldt, "Tabor."

[92] See the critical apparatus for virtually any one of the Semitic names Philo cites.

According to Eissfeldt, the information Philo supplies about these four gods goes back to the eleventh century B.C., and Philo's sources for this passage must have been that old.[93] Eissfeldt has no real evidence for this conclusion. If anything, we have seen that the opposite is true : Zeus Kassios was worshipped down to Roman times, as was the Baal of Mt. Hermon.

Philo concludes his reference to the mortal giants in 808: 8-9. Their sons, he says, called themselves after their mothers, that is, did not know who their fathers were. The children were ignorant of their paternity because their mothers "united freely with anyone upon whom they chanced." This connects Philo's story with the Jewish legends of the fallen angels.

These legends are an expansion of the fragment of myth[94] narrated in Gen. 6: 1-4. Verse 3, whose words are obscure,[95] is difficult. The other verses are reasonably clear, but tell only part of what must have been a longer story of the union of divine beings or minor gods, בני האלהים in the Hebrew, with human women. The Nephilim, famous heroes or giants,[96] were born of these unions. Jewish legend understood the בני האלהים as angels and retold the story accordingly.[97] The angels, under the leadership of Shemhazai, were attracted by the lewd practices, beauty and sensual charm of human women.[98] Two hundred angels descended to Mt. Hermon and swore to cooperate in choosing human wives for themselves. Giants resulted from these unions. The fallen angels then taught mankind all sorts of evil practices, from the use of weapons and cosmetics to exorcism, magic, and divination.[99]

These Biblical and Jewish legends are relics of Canaanite myth.

---

[93] Eissfeldt, "Tabor," p. 38.

[94] Even Cassuto, *Adam*, pp. 199-206 must admit this.

[95] See Orlinsky, *New Translation*, p. 72.

[96] See Num. 13 : 33.

[97] See Hexapla *ad.* Gen. 6 : 1.

[98] See PRE 22, and Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 1, p. 151. Josephus, *AJ* 1, 73 notes that the deeds attributed to the Jewish "angels" resemble the exploits of the giants of Greek myth. See also Column two of the Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran in which Lamech is so impressed with the beauty of Noah that he doubts whether he is Noah's father, and suspects his wife of adultery with one of the עירין, קדישין or נפילין. See Fitzmyer, *Gen. Apoc. Qumran*, p. 79.

[99] Enoch, Chapters 6-8 and Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 1, pp. 124-125.

Spiegel has pointed to the appearance of Danel, the hero of the Ugaritic epic, in the list of the angels. In addition, one of the skills the angels teach mankind is how to dye clothing, a reference to the chief industry of Phoenicia. Finally, as will be clearer below, others of the fallen angels can be identified as Canaanite or Phoenician gods.[100] It would seem that Jewish legend has transformed stories about heroes and gods into tales about angels.[101]

Philo's account of the mortal giants is similar to these Jewish and Biblical stories. Giants, sexual relations with women, and Mt. Hermon appear in both. Some details differ : thus Philo's giants unite *en passant* with the women while in Jewish legend the giants are born from marriages with women. But the similarities, and the Canaanite elements in the Jewish legends, indicate some affinity between the legends and Philo's account. It is impossible to use the two versions to reconstruct the hypothetical original, if there ever was one common original, but the two versions must be crystallizations of the same cycle of stories, with each version modifying that cycle to suit its own assumptions and beliefs. The original cycle must have spoken of gods or heroes whom Philo has Euhemerized and the Jewish legends transformed into angels.[102]

Eissfeldt has plausibly suggested that another, fainter, echo of this cycle of stories may be preserved in Nonnus, *Dionysiaca* 40, 535-575. The ancestors of the Tyrians, from the race of giants, unite with the maiden fountains into whom unreasoning Eros has planted the shafts of love. The similarities to Philo are admittedly few and imprecise, but Nonnus has preserved vague recollections of too much Phoenician mythology in the "Phoenician books" of the *Dionysiaca* for the similarities to be coincidental.[103] Finally, Nonnus' myth is obviously of Tyrian provenance, and this section of Philo's fragments, as will become clearer below, is also of Tyrian origin. Any similarities between Philo and Nonnus are therefore highly significant.

---

[100] Spiegel, "NDJ," pp. 336-341. See also Gordon, *UT*, #719, p. 388. On the basis of unpublished Enoch fragments from Qumran, Milik has found other heroes of ancient myth among the descendants of the fallen angels, e.g., Gilgamesh, See Milik, *Enoch*, *Aramaic Fragments*, pp. 29 and 313.

[101] Spiegel, "NDJ," p. 354. See also Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 5, p. 152, n. 56.

[102] I am not the first to have seen this, see n. 72.

[103] Eissfeldt, *RS*, pp. 133-134.

It should be noted that after these mountains giants the formal aspect of the text changes from a list of parents and children to one of notable members of families, the families being identified by their male ancestors. Individuals are not specified as the (immediate) children but as the (more or less) remote descendants of their predecessors. This change in type of genealogy almost certainly reflects a change in the type of source and suggests that here Philo went over from originally cosmogonic myths to a list of culture heroes (ex-deities). That is, the fragments discussed in this chapter, as they now stand, seem wholly concerned with mortal humans and their inventions. We have seen, however, that the originals of Kolpia, Baau, Aion, Protogonos, and perhaps Genos and Genea must have been cosmogonic. They have been adapted to their new context through the mention of Aion's discovery of food or Genos and Genea's discovery of prayer. Nevertheless, the originals must have been figures of cosmogony. The balance of the fragments to be discussed in this chapter are a true list of culture heroes (ex-deities). At some point Philo must have shifted from an originally cosmogonic source to the list. The change in type of genealogy here suggests that this was the point, and this is confirmed by the change in the character of most of the "persons" of the genealogy, from cosmic elements to individuals.[104]

---

[104] Clapham, pp. 83-114 also noticed that this section of the fragments began with a cosmogony but then shifted to a list of Euhemerized discoverers. Clapham argues that since the name of Geinos Autochthon seems most appropriate to a cosmogony the shift to the lists of discoverers occurs after Geinos. The cosmogonic source, according to Clapham, has seven stages: (1) the east wind & Bauu- 807: 19-20; (2) Olam = Aion = Protogonos - 807: 20-21; (3) the various forms of light - 808: 2-4; (4) Mts. Zaphon, Lebanon etc. - 808: 4-9; (5) Samemroumos and Ousoos who are temple precincts in Tyre and Sidon with cosmic associations - 808: 10-19; (6) Chousor, who functions as the opener of heaven and earth (as in Mochos *FGrH* 784 F 4) 808: 21-27; (7) Geinos Autochthon, the self-born earthly one, i.e. the sky, who is separated from earth by Chousor - 808: 28.
Many different sorts of objections can be raised against this ingenious but tortuous interpretation. The mountains, Sidon, and Tyre precede the separation of heaven and earth. Chousor may have a cosmogonic role in Mochos, but is perhaps the clearest example in Philo of a craftsman god become culture hero. Moreover, Philo's Chousor doesn't separate anything. The most serious objection to Clapham's proposal, however, is that it disregards the shift in the type of genealogy just noted. I agree with Clapham that Philo moved from cosmogonic to culture hero source, but would maintain that the place to put the shift is where the formal type of filiation changes, that is before Samemroumos and Ousoos.

It should be noted, however, that Philo may have found the cosmogony and the list of culture heroes already connected in his immediate source. In fact it is likely that he did so, as that would explain why he transformed the cosmogonic section to a list of culture heroes. We may suppose that every Phoenician city, not to say, temple, had its own mythology, beginning with a cosmogony and theogony and going on to local heroes, of whom many will have been connected with cultural innovations. When Philo (or some predecessor) came to put these lists together he found an embarassing wealth of cosmogonies. He used the verse text above, but then, when he found another at the beginning of the present mythology (probably Tyrian, see below) he felt that two different accounts of the origin of everything would be *de trop*. He didn't want to drop the cosmogonic part of the second account—it must have been an important element in a fixed structure. Therefore he tried to cut it down into an account of men and their inventions. Compare the similar solution of much the same problem by the editor of Genesis 1 and 2.[105]

808: 7-9 ἐκ τούτων-ἐντύχοιεν

The birth and parentage of Samemroumos and Ousoos are described in these lines. Philo's statement that "they called themselves after their mothers" need not mean that they had female names, but merely that they used matronyms instead of the patronyms customary in Greek and Semitic usage, i.e. they would identify themselves as τῆς + mother's name rather than τοῦ + father's name.

The correct reading of the first name is Samemroumos and not Memroumos.[106] Samemroumos is a transliteration of שמם רמם in Hebrew and Phoenician, and is perfectly translated by *Hypsouranios*. The name means "High heaven." The name of his brother, Ousoos, must be introduced by emendation as it has fallen out of the MSS., but the emendation is certain.[107]

The Phoenician phrase שמם רמם appears in one Sidonian inscription where the context demands that it be the name of part of Greater

---

[105] I owe this interpretation to a suggestion of Professor Morton Smith.

[106] Cf. Williams, p. 159.

[107] The emendation was first proposed by Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 818, n. 5.

Sidon.[108] A related phrase שממאדרם appears in another Sidonian inscription where the context makes similar demands.[109] While the interpretation of these words as names of districts has been disputed,[110] no other interpretation proposed fits the context as well. We shall therefore suppose that Samemroumos in Philo goes back to the district of Sidon called שמם רמם. Eissfeldt has maintained that Phoenician place names were consistently feminine.[111] If so, this might explain Philo's statement that Samemroumos took his name from his mother, but the form and customary gender of both elements of שמם רמם are masculine.

Samemroumos or שמם רמם also appears in a totally different context, in an epithet of the goddess Anat. She is described in a Ugaritic text as *bʿlt šmm rmm*, "Lady of the High Heavens."[112] If שמם רמם was used only in titles of goddesses Philo's statement that the name was taken from a female would be confirmed in another sense. Given the common pairing of deities in the area, it would seem likely that there was a בעל שמם רמם to match the בעלת. If so, Philo's statement probably indicates that the goddess was by far the more important figure of the pair.[113]

The second brother, Ousoos, was originally identified with Biblical Esau,[114] an identification which seemed appropriate because the names were similar; both were hunters (808: 12 and Gen. 25:27), and each had a brother who dwelt in or invented shelters (Gen. 25:27) and with whom he quarreled. Ousoos is also now identified as a section of Tyre, called Uzu in Egyptian and Babylonian documents.[115] Uzu is the section the Greeks called Palaityros or Old Tyre, the mainland coast facing the island city. Once again, if place names are feminine in Phoenician, Philo's statement of the feminine origin of the names will be confirmed; and perhaps Philo's male Samemroumos and Ousoos are the Baals of places bearing those names (in Sidon and Tyre respectively, one would assume).[116]

---

[108] KAI 15, the inscription of Bodashtart of Sidon. For a discussion of the date of this inscription see Peckham, *Development*, pp. 77-87.

[109] KAI 14, lines 16 & 17.

[110] See KAI Vol. 2, p. 22, and Cooke, *Textbook*, p. 36. See also Teixidor, "BES 1969," p. 332. See further Teixidor, *The Pagan God*, p. 39.

[111] Eissfeldt, *RS*, pp. 63f.

[112] RS. 24. 250, line 7 = *Ugaritica* V, p. 553. Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Etudes*, p. 119 notes a Greek inscription from Delos in which Αvατ ραμ[α] appears.

[113] Cf. Baalat Gebal, the "Lady of Byblos." Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Ancien Dieu," p. 8 suggests that Samemroumos is the Baalshamem of Tyre. The Tyrian connections of Samemroumos will be discussed below. That Samemroumos was a Baalshamem is plausible. On the Tyrian Baalshamem see further the discussion on Melqart, 811 : 9-10.

[114] Scaliger *ap.* Orelli, p. 17, n. 26. Since Ousoos may be connected with Esau it would be interesting if come connection between Jacob and Samemroumos could be established. While there is no such direct connection it should be noted that Jacob was considered a god by the authors of *PGM*. See *PGM* III, 71*; 77*; XXXVI, 12-22; IV, 2223ff.; XII, 370f., 445ff., 466f. There are numerous similar passages in *PGM*. See Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 5. pp. 290-291.

808: 10-11 εἶτά-παπύρου

As will be clearer below, Samemroumos = Hypsouranios and Ousoos were rivals, a rivalry which must reflect the conflicts of the places with which their names are associated. Thus far, the assumption is that Samemroumos = Hypsouranios stands for a section of Sidon; but the statement that Hypsouranios lived at Tyre (οἰκῆσαι) is difficult to explain on that assumption. Perhaps it means that in those days *even* Hypsouranios-Samemroumos of Sidon lived at Tyre, but this is not what one expects here. In a context of culture-heroes οἰκῆσαι should mean "settle" or "found" as in 807: 22 above. Samemroumos = Hypsouranios must somehow be a Tyrian, not a Sidonian. We may suppose there was a section of Tyre called שמם רמם, a name which came from an epithet of the deity worshipped there. The deity and quarter of town in Tyre, otherwise unknown, would be similar to the attested ones in Sidon. The rivalry below between Samemroumos = Hypsouranios and Ousoos would therefore be between two sections of Tyre, not between Sidon and Tyre.

The discoveries in this section follow a reasonably evolutionary pattern. Aion discovers food from trees; Genos and Genea, Phoenicia and prayer; Phos, Pyr, and Phlox fire; Hypsouranios builds the simple, primitive shelter from reeds, rushes, and papyrus. As Clemen and Williams have noted,[117] the details of this last discovery are somewhat perplexing. Reeds, rushes, and papyrus all suggest an Egyptian rather than a Phoenician setting. The difficulty, however, is only apparent as papyrus grew in marshes outside Egypt,[118] and therefore might have grown near Tyre.[119]

---

[115] See the lists of Egyptian conquests, *ANET*, p. 243 and the annals of Sennacherib, *ANET*, p. 287. Cheyne, "Esau and Usoos," p. 189 was the first to see the relevance of these documents to Philo.

[116] Cf. Clemen, p. 47. Eusebius, *De Laud. Const.*, 13 equated Usoros [*sic*] and Melqart.

[117] Williams, p. 160; Clemen, pp. 45-46. See also D.S. 1,43,4.

808 : 11 στασιάσαι-Οὔσωον.

The rivalry of Samemroumos = Hypsouranios and Ousoos is here explicitly mentioned. Eissfeldt takes the two names as representing Sidon and Tyre respectively and interprets the reference to the rivalry as a reference to the long history of conflict between Sidon and Tyre for the dominant position in Phoenician affairs.[120] By the Hellenistic period this conflict had become a debate over which city had been the common original settlement, the mother city of the area, with both Tyrian and Sidonian coins claiming that their city had been the one.[121] In Philo's account, according to Eissfeldt, the conflict of the cities has become that of the brothers Samemroumos = Hypsouranios and Ousoos; their quarrel is the beginning of the disputes of the cities.

Eissfeldt's interpretation is not, however, acceptable. We have seen that Samemroumos = Hypsouranios does not stand for a section of Sidon but of Tyre. Moreover, the conflict of Sidon and Tyre was so important that it should not be represented by the extremely minor—almost totally insignificant—conflict of Samemroumos = Hypsouranios and Ousoos in the fragments. For both these reasons the conflict more probably reflects one between two sections of Tyre.[122]

Where in Tyre might Samemroumos = Hypsouranios be located? Since Ousoos is associated with the mainland, Samemroumos = Hypsouranios might represent the island part of the city. If this is so the conflict between the brothers might then be between the islanders and mainlanders. Samemroumos = Hypsouranios (the islanders) according to Philo invented shelters, while Ousoos (representing the mainlanders) was a hunter. This fact may allow a further hypothesis. Perhaps the conflict was between the sedentary islanders and the more nomadic hunters on the mainland. The conflict in the fragments would then reflect the very ancient theme of the conflict between nomadic and sedentary types (a conflict remotely reflected in the Biblical stories of Jacob and Esau).[123] Finally, if this is the true explanation of the fragments, the relative insignificance of the conflict is also understandable. The rivalry would not be the important dispute between Sidon and Tyre, but local.

---

[118] See Theophrastus, *HP* 4,8,4; Cf. 9,7,1. See also Pliny *NH* 13,73.

[119] There is a swamp near Tyre on the map in Eissfeldt, "Tyros," cols. 1877-1878. There was another swamp near Haifa, not to speak of the Huleh.

[120] Eissfeldt, *RS*, pp. 62-67.

[121] See Hill, *BMC Phoenicia*, Sidon, numbers 87-91 and p. cxxxiii.

[122] Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, p. 39 dropped his earlier suggestion of the rivalry between Sidon and Tyre and adopted the solution I have proposed of an internal Tyrian rivalry. Eissfeldt does not, however, explain his change of mind.

Whatever the interpretation one important conclusion is apparent: Philo's story is Tyrian. If the conflict is between Sidon and Tyre the latter has primacy; if between two sections of Tyre, Tyre is the setting. It is therefore likely that Philo's sources for this story are Tyrian. We have seen above that there are similarities between Philo's account of the giants and Tyrian mythology preserved by Nonnus. The idea that Philo derived all the material in this section of the fragments from Tyrian sources is at least a plausible hypothesis.

808 : 11-15 ὅς-ἐμβῆναι

Two discoveries are attributed to Ousoos: clothing made from animal skins and the first boat, or more properly dugout. This combination of discoveries has caused Eissfeldt, Lokkegaard and other scholars to conclude that Ousoos was the craftsman god of Tyre, whose name was a transliteration of Ugaritic *ḫss*.[124] This explanation emphasizes the second of Ousoos' discoveries and pays less attention to the first. Jewish legend suggests another explanation of Ousoos' function, an explanation which admittedly emphasizes the first of his discoveries at the expense of the second.

Jewish legends tell of the pair of fallen angels עוזא and עזאל.[125] Since Jewish angels, as we have seen above, may be metamorphoses of Canaanite gods or heroes, there may have been one god or hero called עוזא; Philo's Ousoos could then refer to the same personality.[126] This argument can be taken a step further. After the punishment of the angels Azael supposedly continued to sin and to entice women with his devilish dyes and feminine finery, במיני צבעונים של נשים.[127] Azael of the legends is thus involved in making clothing, much like our Ousoos, although Ousoos makes his clothing from skins while Azael is a dyer. I therefore suggest that Philo and the Jewish legends are discussing the same figure, the god associated with the skills used to make clothing. This god may also have been the Baal of the place in Tyre called Uzu, as was discussed above. All these aspects of the god would unite beautifully if there were some evidence that Old Tyre was at some time *the* center of the clothing industry. Unfortunately I can find none. Heaps of murex shells, for example, are found up and down the entire Phoenician coast, on the island part of Tyre, as well as on the mainland.[128] Admittedly, this explanation disregards the invention of the dugout. Perhaps this is because Philo (or his source) has combined several different myths. One told of Samemroumos = Hypsouranios' settlement of Tyre; the second of the conflict of Samemroumos and of Ousoos and of their contrasting inventions, Samemroumos = Hypsouranios—fixed shelters, Ousoos—portable shelter and clothing. The attribution of a dugout to Ousoos might be part of a third, originally unrelated, myth which told of his discovery of ships, sailing, stelai, sacrifices, etc.[129]

---

[123] See Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, pp. 320-323. Cf. a similar discussion, Troiani, pp. 109-110.

[124] Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, p. 39; Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 60; Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Ancien Dieu," pp. 18-22. These scholars must assume that the craftsman functions have been split among several gods, a not unlikely assumption. See p. 170.

[125] TB Yoma 67b.

808: 15-19 ἀνιερῶσαι-ἔτος

After his successful voyage Ousoos consecrated two stelai to Fire and Wind, presumably as the two gods who had made the voyage possible. When Ousoos and his brother died they were deified by their descendants. The beliefs and practices of Ousoos and his posterity thus conform to Philo's theories (805: 25ff.). The two stelai consecrated by Ousoos are probably represented on Tyrian coins of the third century A.D., in some cases with the legend "Ambrosial Rocks."[130] (Nonnus speaks of the "Ambrosial Rocks" in other terms, almost as forming the rocks of the island of Tyre;[131] evidently the legend circulated in various forms, but the official version will have been that represented by the coins on which the rocks clearly appear as stelai or baetyls.)[132] Ousoos' stelai are presumably also to be identified with the two stelai Herodotus claimed to have seen in the temple of "Herakles" at Tyre, though Herodotus' report makes one golden.[133]

---

[126] See n. 72. עזאל is formed, like many names of angels, by adding אל to עוזא. There thus may be a single antecedent of both עוזא and עזאל.

[127] Yalkut Gen. 44, cited by Spiegel, "NDJ," p. 352. See now Milik, *Enoch, Aramaic Fragments*, pp. 321-331.

[128] See Jensen, "Royal Purple," p. 106.

[129] I owe this interpretation to a suggestion of Professor Morton Smith. The tradition which attributes sailing to Ousoos is unclear on another point: where did he sail from and where did he sail to. From the description in Philo it seems that he left the mainland of Tyre for the island, and there set up the two stelai. Will, "Sanctuaire d'Heracles," pp. 7-11 has suggested that representations of this first voyage may be preserved on third century Tyrian coins, such as Hill, *BMC Phoenicia*, Pl. XLIV, 6.

808: 19-21 χρόνοις-ἁλιεῖς

Agreus, hunter and Halieus, fisherman are the next pair, born from the family of Hypsouranios.[134] Their inventions were indicated by their names. Williams doubts whether there were gods with these names or whether they are fictions invented by Philo to suit the inventions.[135] The nature of this section of the fragments argues strongly that Philo turned gods into inventors rather than created fictions.

Since Scaliger, many scholars have seen Agreus as the Greek translation of Hebrew-Phoenician צר.[136] That is, Philo's Agreus, the "inventor," i.e. god, of hunting would have been called צר in Phoenician. When inscriptional evidence of the existence of a Phoenician deity צר began to accumulate, the hypothesis seemed confirmed.[137] More recent evidence, particularly the inscriptions from Antas, shows that

---

[130] Hill, *BMC Phoenicia*, Tyre, #427, 429-430 and Pl. XXXIII, 13, 14 & 15; XLIV, 7.

[131] Nonnus, *Dionysiaca*, 40,429-534.

[132] Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Origine," p. 133.

[133] Hdt. 2,44. Bochart, p. 24 was the first to notice this point.

[134] Hunters and fishermen go naturally together, See Jer. 16: 16. Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, p. 59, n. 1.

[135] Williams, p. 161 believes that Agreus and Alieus were fictions. The problem is similar to that of Phos, Pyr, and Phlox discussed above, p. 152.

[136] Scaliger, p. 35.

[137] CIS 1, 102 = KAI 49, line 34. See the comments in KAI *ad loc.*, and in Clemen, p. 48. See also Teixidor, "BES 1967," #64, pp. 179-180.

צר had nothing to do with hunting.[138] While there is still much debate about his role, צר can now only be connected with Philo's Agreus if one supposes that Philo produced the equation צר = Agreus = God of hunting as an error or misinterpretation. A mosaic at Antioch portrays with Nereids a horned Triton identified as Agreus (which can mean "fisherman" in Greek).[139] This mosaic may be connected with Philo's Halieus.

808: 21-24 ἐξ ὧν-πλεῦσαι

The correct reading of the name of the "inventor" is Chousor.[140] The identity of this character was not well understood before the discovery of the Ugaritic epics and was one of the first enigmas in Philo to be resolved by the Ugaritic documents.[141] Philo's Chousor, the iron worker, identified with Hephaistos, is the Ugaritic craftsman god *kṯr wḫss*. Philo's figure and the god of the Ugaritic epics are identical in function except that the Ugaritic god goes not perform magical acts in the epics; magical acts are performed only once and then by El.[142] Clapham and Kapelrud have proposed a partial solution for this problem by pointing to the passage of the Baal epic (68: 11-24) in which *kṯr wḫss* makes weapons for Baal, and apparently has the ability to endow the weapons with special powers by uttering imprecational names.[143] Gaster has completed the solution of the problem in anthropological and philosophical terms by pointing to the numerous instances where magic and crafts are the function of one god or group of gods. In Greece, for example, there are the *Daktyloi*, both magicians and craftsmen.[144] This evidence can be supplemented with proof from Ras Shamra itself: several Ugaritic texts identify corresponding Ugaritic and Akkadian gods. In one of these *kṯr wḫss* is equated with Ea.[145] Ea is the Mesopotamian god of magic.

---

[138] See Amadasi, "Sid," p. 99; Garbini, "Iscrizioni," pp. 330-331. See also Teixidor, "BES 1970," #73, pp. 371-372.

[139] IGLS, 751.

[140] Cf. Williams, pp. 161-2 who has some doubts.

[141] See Meyer, *GdA*, Vol. II,2, p. 180, n. 5. Cf. Eissfeldt, *RS*. pp. 28-29.

[142] Gordon, *UT*, 126: V: 35. Cf. *Ibid*, #1325, pp. 424-425.

[143] Clapham, p. 106; Kapelrud, *Baal*, p. 85.

[144] See Gaster, *Thespis*, pp. 161-163. On the Daktyloi see Rose, "Idaean Dactyls," p. 449.

[145] R.S. 20.24 line 15 = *Ugaritica* V, p. 51. See also Clapham, p. 107.

Chousor's invention of the raft and of fishing implements may also be connected with his Ugaritic role. If Clapham and Oldenburg are correct, another name for *kṯr wḫss* was *qdš wamrr*;[146] the latter is regularly called the "fisherman of Asherah, *dgy atrt*" (e.g. ʿnt: VI: 10-11) in the epics. Philo's connecting Chousor with maritime skills and fishing would thus make sense.

Chousor's invention of the raft can be seen as an advance on the invention of Ousoos, the single log or dugout; Ousoos was the first to venture onto the sea, but Chousor discovered sailing. Thus there seems to be no contradiction and no need here to assume that Philo has combined different sources, though he may have.[147] Yet later the Kabeiroi were the first to invent a (shaped!) boat (809: 12). Again, Philo may have intended the discoverable distinctions, or may have carelessly combined his sources.[148]

Scholars were so excited by the discovery of Chousor's Ugaritic origins that they concluded that Philo's sources must somehow be as old as the Ugaritic poems, and date from some time before 1200 B.C.[149] Alas, Ugaritic *kṯr wḫss* was of the bronze age. The metals he works are gold and silver; iron is never mentioned.[150] Philo's Chousor, as represented in the fragments, works only with iron. Thus Philo's sources were at least reworked in the iron age. The comparison between Philo's Chousor and his Ugaritic counterpart indicates the gap between the two sets of documents rather than their contemporaneity.[151]

---

[146] Clapham, p. 107; Oldenburg, *Conflict*, p. 98.

[147] This is Gruppe's position; Gruppe, pp. 378ff.

[148] See Baudissin, "Sanchuniathon," p. 457; Clemen, pp. 56ff.; Williams, p. 161; Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 52.

[149] Eissfeldt, *RS*, p. 58. Chousor appears in Punic and Neo-Punic names. See Chapter Six, p. 95, n. 3.

[150] Gordon, *UT*, 51: I: 24; 51: VI: 30-40. In spite of this difference there is no reason to doubt the accuracy of the identification of Philo's Chousor and Ugaritic *kṯr wḫss*. The interpretation proposed by Lewy, "Husarum," pp. 154-162 is completely improbable. Cf. Troiani, pp. 114ff.

[151] One of the few scholars to realize the significance of this difference for dating Philo's sources is Barr, "Philo of Byblos," p. 59.

A further transformation of Ugaritic *kṯr wḫss* is in Mochos *FGrH* 784 F 4 in which he is the god of separation who opens the cosmic egg.

A few words on Clapham's interpretation of Chousor seem appropriate. Clapham's interpretation, summarized above Chapter Five, p. 72, n. 30, is based on the prior

808: 24-25 διὸ καὶ-Μειλίχιον

The attributes of Zeus Meilichios seem inappropriate to Chousor, as Ewald noted. Ewald therefore proposed that this phrase was a translation and transliteration of the Phoenician אל מליח. This would fit the context better, as מליח would allude to Chousor's connection with sailors (מלח) and hence to his discovery of the light boat.[152] If some connection could be established between Chousor and the Pataikoi (the dwarf protective images of Phoenician ships according to Herodotus 3,37), Ewald's conclusions would be more attractive.[153] There is, however, no proof of that connection and Ewald's proposal necessitates our making the difficult assumption that Philo understood Dia Meilichion as a combination of translation and transliteration. Finally, while מלח meaning mariner may be attested,[154] the form מליח is unattested and unlikely in Phoenician, and would not yield the vowels of *Meilichios*; nor would it make good sense.

Lokkegaard has therefore attempted a totally different interpretation of the title, beginning with the assumption that Chousor is somehow aptly described as the benign or kindly god. Lokkegaard correctly realizes the extent of his problem and recognizes that it is El, not *kṯr wḫss*, who is called the "kindly One" in the Ugaritic epics (*ltpn il dpid*).[155] Nevertheless, Lokkegaard maintains that such an epithet might be thought applicable to Chousor because of Arabic *kawṯar* which means a hospitable man. The supposition that a root meaning first found in Arabic in the seventh century A.D. (and later) can safely be read into a Ugaritic name of the fourteenth century B.C. is not very

---

assumption that Ugarit is the proper matrix into which Philo's sources must fit. But as has been shown repeatedly (e.g. Chapter Six, 131-139) this assumption is simply not true. Furthermore, Clapham equates Chousor & Egyptian Thoth. Yet Ugaritic *kṯr wḫss* was probably identified with Egyptian Ptah (Albright, *YGC*, p. 137). This equation would be confirmed by Chousor's role in Mochos' cosmogony which was clearly originally Ptah's (Albright, *YGC*, pp. 222-223; Gaster, *Thespis*, p. 164).

[152] Ewald, p. 18. Zeus Meilichios, "the kindly Zeus," (a euphemism) was an underworld power, giver of fertility and wealth, but also of punishment and death; he was often represented as a serpent and identified with Agathos Daimon. See Cook, *Zeus*, Vol. 2, pp. 1091-1160. Ewald has been followed by Oldenburg, *Conflict*, p. 98, n. 8.

[153] Albright, "Dwarf Craftsmen," pp. 58-59 is inconclusive.

[154] Harris, *Grammar*, s.v. p. 117.

[155] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 61. For a similar conclusion see Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Ancien Dieu," p. 19, n. 2.

likely. Moreover, *kawṯar* may not mean a liberal or hospitable man,[156] and even if it did there is a gap between a hospitable man and a kindly god. The likelihood is that Chousor and Zeus Meilichios were connected as givers of wealth—a major function of Agathos Daimon and of skilled industry. The *trait d'union* is therefore probably Greek Hephaistos.[157]

808: 25-26 οἱ δὲ-ἐκ πλίνθων

This passage is confusing. Chousor supposedly has brothers yet all the other inventors discussed were in pairs. Clemen and others were so disturbed by this departure from the norm that they emended τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς to the singular τὸν ἀδελφὸν, thus making this case conform to the others.[158] If we posessed the full text of the *Phoenician History* this difficulty might be resolved.

Whatever the case, the invention ascribed to Chousor's brothers is a continuation of the functions of Ugaritic *kṯr wẖss*. The brothers discover how to build walls of bricks; in the Ugaritic epics *kṯr wẖss* is the divine architect who builds the palace of Baal.[159]

808: 26-809: 1 μετὰ ταῦτα-ἐξεῦρον

The next generation of discoverers were also craftsmen. Philo's text attributes to them the discoveries of the use of chaff in brick making, of drying bricks in the sun, and of how to build roofs.[160] The name of one, Technites, is the common Greek word for artisan, and therefore appropriate. The other, Geinos Autochthon, poses something of a problem as his name means earthborn native and seems more

---

156 I owe this information to Dr. M. Held.

157 See above n. 152. Troiani, p. 119 tentatively suggests that Philo's Zeus Meilichios may be connected with Baal Malage of the Baalu treaty. This is attractive but unlikely since the consonants differ.

158 Clemen, p. 50.

159 Gordon, *UT*, 51: VI: entire column. See also Clapham, pp. 108-109. The brick walls built might more properly be rendered as stone walls, or walls made of blocks of stone in order to avoid a contradiction with the invention of bricks made of straw below. See Spiegel, "NDJ," p. 344, n. 13.

160 See the preceding note. Accepting that interpretation one is not obliged here to search for evidence of brick making without straw. Cf. Exod. 5: 8.

appropriate to a cosmogony than to a list of inventors. Perhaps, as Lokkegaard suggests, he is the first scientific farmer.[161]

There is a proliferation of craftsmen gods in Philo: Chousor, his brothers, Geinos, and Technites. The technical functions seemingly held by *kṯr wḫss* alone in the Ugaritic epics have been split up among many.[162] Lokkegaard believes that this division of functions is a sign of the advances in culture between Ugarit and Philo's day. The more advanced culture, with more specialized skills, requires a comparable specialization of gods or inventors. Another explanation, rather complementary than alternative, can be offered. Ugaritic, as Lokkegaard realized, contains numerous gods with two or more names. The craftsman god is called *kṯr wḫss*, Sir Adroit and Cunning, in Gaster's apt translation.[163] Another name for the same god is *Hyn*, the expert or understanding one.[164] Modern scholars were confused at first by this profusion of names and divided this one god into three separate deities.[165] Might not Philo or his sources have been similarly confused?[166] It is also possible that Greek mythology might have exercised a direct influence here. Lagrange points to the Athenian tradition of the several sons of Hephaistos, one of whom is Erichthonios, described by Euripides as *Gēgenēs*.[167] Perhaps these sons of Hephaistos, one of whom is an earth-born native, were responsible for Philo's traditions of Hephaistos = Chousor's brothers.[168]

809: 1-6 ἀπὸ τούτων-καλοῦνται

Agros and Hero of Agros (or "of the field") or Agrotes are usually understood as related to agriculture and the fields, as their names suggest. Applying the principle established at the beginning of the chapter they must have been gods of the field for a non-Euhemerist. In Phoenician one of their names might have been שד.[169] Baal Sadeh ("Beelseddi") is known from a latin inscription, in which he is identified with Jupiter.[170] This god must have been quite important to the people who erected the inscription, as they identified him with Jupiter. Perhaps they shared the veneration of the Byblians. Representations of this god may be preserved in a mosaic found at Antioch and a sculptured base from Mariut in Egypt. The cultivated fields are personified and identified as Agros.[171] It is uncertain, however, whether the mosaic was intended as a portrait of gods or as an allegory; similarly the base. Agros is accompanied on the mosaic by Oinos and Opora, on the base by Prochreia and Geouchia, suggesting that allegory was intended. Such allegorization, however, may help explain Philo's choice of the Greek name for the deity.

---

[161] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 62.

[162] *Ibid.*

[163] Gaster, *Thespis*, p. 161.

[164] See e.g. Gaster, *Thespis*, p. 163.

[165] See e.g. Virolleaud, "Nouveau Chant," p. 117.

[166] Oldenburg, *Conflict*, p. 98, and Clapham, pp. 109-110 both propose this explanation of the proliferation of craftsmen gods.

[167] Eur. *Ion*, 20. Lagrange, p. 375.

[168] Clemen, p. 52 rejects this interpretation on trivial grounds, based upon his determination to derive the whole structure from unknown Phoenician antecedents, without any substantial Greek accretions. But Greek—especially Athenian—mythology is likely to have exercised a strong influence on Phoenicia, and had half a millennium before Philo's time in which to do it.

Lokkegaard has suggested that Agros in Philo may not be part of the context of agricultural gods but may be a transliteration of the Ugaritic god *Ugr*, one of Baal's messengers.[172] *Ugr*'s name would have entered because his name sounded like that of the agricultural gods. But all the discoveries in this section of the fragments come in pairs, and unless there is some overwhelming difficulty, there is no reason to suppose that one of the members of a pair has been misplaced because of the sound of his name. Thus here there is no reason to suppose that Agros in this context has anything to do with Baal's messenger.

---

[169] First suggested by Ewald, p. 19. Hvidberg-Hansen, "Baal Malage," pp. 69-74 attempts to turn Baal Malage of the Baalu treaty into an agricultural deity and into Philo's Agrotes. This attempt is hopelessly wrong as it disregards Baal Malage's place in the Baalu treaty where he appears together with Baal Zaphon and Baalshamem as a god who controls the winds. Hvidberg-Hansen's attempt to finesse his way around this difficulty is unconvincing, pp. 77-78. See further Teixidor, "BES 1974," #56, p. 309.

[170] IGLS 2925 from Timna on the west side of the Beqa. Based on this inscription one should reject the suggestion of Clapham, p. 117 that Philo's Agros = שד is really a misunderstanding of El's epithet (later transfered to YHWH) שדי, "the mountain one;" (on this epithet see Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, pp. 52-55). We have here another example of Clapham's prefering an obscure interpretation based on Ugaritic sources to a more obvious and plausible explanation based on sources closer to Philo's time.

[171] IGLS 1011. Morey, *Mosaics*, p. 33; the base is now in Alexandria. See Breccia, *Musée Greco-Romain*, pp. 57ff. amd pl. XXXVI, n. 126.

[172] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 62. Pope & Rollig, "Syrien," pp. 284-285 agree with this suggestion. Clapham, pp. 116-117 rightly rejects this proposal.

The Byblians worship Agrotes or Hero of Agros as a god. His shrine is drawn by a pair of oxen. This shrine has been identified by Du Mesnil du Buisson as the shrine of Jupiter Heliopolitanus which is also represented as drawn by a pair of animals.[173] Philo, according to Du Mesnil du Buisson, was supposedly describing the Jupiter of Baalbek, and even when Philo says that this god is especially worshipped by the Byblians he is still referring to that god : Byblians stands for Phoenicians. These references to Baalbek are supposedly confirmed by the description of the inventions. One of the inventions is of cellars, which Du Mesnil du Buisson sees as referring to the vast underground storage areas at Baalbek which, according to him, were sometimes used for rituals.[174]

Du Mesnil du Buisson, I believe, was partially correct: Philo's Agrotes was represented much like Jupiter Heliopolitanus. But Philo is quite specific in stating that he is discussing a Byblian god so the reference to Jupiter Heliopolitanus is unlikely. The inventions—courtyards, fences, cellars—are all the last stages in the perfection of a house and the context suggests that ordinary cellars are intended not huge underground chambers like those at Baalbek.[175]

The discussion of Agros and Agrotes or Hero of Agros thus far has been based on the assumption that they were related to the fields. This assumption, however, is weakened by the statement that this pair were the ancestors of ordinary hunters and of those who use dogs in hunting. Perhaps the names Agros and Agrotes were derived from the Greek word for hunting *agra.* Another difficulty is that Philo here repeats a discovery, since hunting has already been attributed to Agreus in 808 : 20. These difficulties stand as testimonies to our incomplete understanding of the text, no doubt, because of its fragmentary character.[176]

The final sentence of the passage may be a clue to the complex identity of Agros and Agrotes or Hero of Agros. The identification with the wanderers or Titans was already understood by Bunsen as suggesting some connection between Agros and Agrotes and the נפילים.[177] If such figures existed in the Phoenician world they would connect this part of the discovery section with the story of Sons of Gods or fallen angels. Bunsen's suggestion can be amplified in another sense. We now know of a group of Ugaritic deities called the רפאים. These gods, much like Greek Titans,[178] are gods of the earth. A recently published text establishes that the רפאים were also charioteers.[179] An attractive if unprovable assumption would be to give the רפאים a third (but related) function—hunting.[180] If the רפאים could be demonstrated to control hunting and to be earth gods, one of the obscurities in the fragments might be solved.[181]

---

[173] Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Etudes*, pp. 48-51.

[174] *Ibid.*

[175] For a critique of Du Mesnil du Buisson from a slightly different perspective see Troiani, pp. 129-130.

[176] Cf. Lagrange, p. 376.

809: 6-7 ἀπὸ τούτων-ποίμνας

Amunos and Magos introduce villages and flocks, another advance in the material civilization. Their names have been difficult to explain.[182] Lokkegaard proposed that Amunos might be a transliteration of *ʾamin*, the trustworthy one or נאמן in Hebrew, and might allude to the well fortified Syrian towns he founded.[183] This explanation is sheer fantasy. Lokkegaard was more cautious with Magos, and did not attempt an explanation.[184]

Clapham has been more successful. He proposed that Amunos and Magos should be connected with a pair of Baals who appear together in a Punic inscription of the third century B.C., KAI 78, lines 3-4: Baal *ḥmn* and Baal *mgnn*. Amunos would be a Graecized transliteration of the former (and appears as *Amoun* in a recently discovered inscription);[185] Magos of the latter.[186] The two figures appear together in Philo, as they do in the inscription.

---

[177] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 824, n. 1.

[178] Rose, *Handbook*, pp. 21-22; Clapham, pp. 158-159.

[179] Margulis, "Ugaritic Psalm," pp. 299-302. Rephaim is also one of the names of the descendants of the fallen angels. See Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 1, p. 151.

[180] One of the names of the descendants of fallen angels is גבורים. Ginzberg, *Legends*, Vol. 1, p. 151, and at least one of the גבורים, Nimrod, was a famous hunter, Gen. 10: 8-9.

[181] It should be noted that the connection with the Rephaim, known from Ugarit, is not a criterion for dating. The Rephaim were worshipped as gods of the netherworld in Sidon at the time of Eshmunazar (KAI 14, 8) and are also mentioned in the Neo-Punic inscription KAI 117, 1 of the first century A.D.

[182] See Orelli, p. 22, n. 46 and Clemen, pp. 54-55.

[183] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 63.

[184] *Ibid.*, p. 63, n. 6. Lokkegaard suggests that Magos might have something to do with Arabic *mgy* meaning to traverse a region, but this meaning is irrelevant to the context.

The identity of Baal *ḥmn* is a problem which has been discussed previously in this work (above, pp. 154-155). Solutions which have been proposed such as "Lord of the incense burner," or "Lord of the Amanus," have been rejected. Indeed, the only certain conclusion concerning Baal *ḥmn* is that this god was identified with Ugaritic El. How Ugaritic El came to be called (or identified with) Baal *ḥmn* is a puzzle which has not been resolved and for which I have no solution to offer.[187] Baal *mgnn* is explained by Clapham as being derived from the Hebrew-Phoenician root *mgn* which Dahood has shown can mean "suzerain."[188] Baal *mgnn* thus emerges as the equivalent of Ugaritic Hadad-Baal.[189] Philo's Amunos and Magos, Baal *ḥmn* and Baal *mgnn*, thus represent Ugaritic El and Baal.

All of the points in this interpretation, according to Clapham, are confirmed and further illuminated by two Ugaritic texts. The first text describes El and Baal together at a divine banquet. This text, according to Clapham, demonstrates that El and Baal were a pair in the minds of the people of Ugarit, much as in Philo and KAI 78. More significantly for Clapham, Baal is there called a shepherd.[190] This would confirm Philo's ascription of the invention of herds to Amunos and Magos. The other text mentions Baal and not El, but once again describes Baal as a shepherd.[191]

Although there are still many obscurities surrounding Baal *ḥmn*, Clapham's interpretation should be accepted. It has the particular merit of recognizing that Philo's Amunos and Magos must be connected with Baal *ḥmn* and Baal *mgnn* of KAI 78.

---

[185] See Leglay, *Saturne Africain*, p. 439.

[186] Clapham, pp. 125-126.

[187] CIS, I, 4943; Albright, *YGC*, pp. 144 & 233 depends on Ingholt. Cf. above, n. 88.

[188] Dahood, *Psalms*, Vol. 1, pp. 16-17. See further Benz, *Personal Names*, p. 339.

[189] Clapham, pp. 126-127.

[190] *Ugaritica* V, Text 2, lines 3-4 = RS 24.252.

[191] *Ibid.*, Text 3, lines 1-2 = RS 24.245.

809: 7-9 ἀπό τούτων-εὗρον

Philo's Misor and Sydyk are transliterations of Hebrew-Phoenician מישר and צדק respectively.[192] In both Hebrew and Phoenician these two words form a pair and Philo has properly associated them.[193] The translations Philo offers, Misor as εὔλυτον or easily solved, Sydyk as δίκαιον or just, pose a problem. The translation of Sydyk is perfect, but that of Misor is not apt, even if it gives a possible Greek equivalent for מישר.[194] When associated with צדק in Hebrew or Phoenician מישר is equivalent, and should have been rendered by a synonym of δίκαιον. Philo has a translation that is circuitous at best: when legal problems are straightforward (a possible sense of מישר) they are easily solved (ευ-λυω) and justice results. Philo or his source(s) may have been playing with etymologies, and if Philo is responsible it would suggest that he had a fair knowledge of Phoenician, even if he did not choose to use words in their most obvious senses.[195] But if so, why he chose a circuitous translation is unanswered.[196]

Like all the other characters in this section of the fragments, Misor and Sydyk should be gods whom Philo has Euhemerized into mortals. Evidence for the worship of gods Misor and Sydyk by Phoenicians was, until recently, not decisive.[197] Newly discovered lists of gods from Ras Shamra, in which the double god *ṣdq mšr* receive offerings, have finally settled the issue.[198]

---

[192] Cf. Meyer, *GdA*, Vol. 2,2, p. 162; also Du Mesnil du Buisson, *NE*, pp. 73-74.

[193] *yšr*//*ṣdq*: KAI 4, lines 6 & 7; Gordon, *UT*, #2147, pp. 472-3; On the Ugaritic evidence see Loewenstamm, "Philon," p. 319; Deut. 32: 4. On the Biblical group צדק//מישר see Prov. 8: 6 or Isa. 11: 4.

[194] Difficulty first noticed by Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 825, n. 13.

[195] Cf. Williams, pp. 31-32.

[196] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 825, n. 13 and many since suggest that Philo might have chosen this translation because he was thinking of Aramaic שרא. If this were true, Philo's knowledge of Phoenician would have been quite limited. See Barr, "Philo of Byblos," pp. 43-44. For a defense of the accuracy of Philo's translation see Cazelles, "Ideologie Royale," pp. 65-68.

[197] Rosenberg, "Sedeq," pp. 161-177; Teixidor, "Nouveau Papyrus," p. 285, line 3 and pp. 289-290. There has been some discussion of the authenticity of this papyrus: see Naveh, "Aramaica Dubiosa," pp. 321-325 and Teixidor, "Madrid Papyrus," pp. 340-342. For a comprehensive discussion of the state of the question prior to the publication of the Ugaritic pantheon-list see Liverani, "Sydyk e Misor."

[198] *Ugaritica* V, p. 585 = RS. 24.271, line 14. For a discussion of the significance of this text see Moor, "Studies ...I," p. 228.

Philo's Misor and Sydyk are thus definitely the equivalents of Babylonian Mesharu & Kittum,[199] two gods associated with Shamash and part of his retinue.[200] The solar associations of צדק or Sydyk may be behind the phrase שמש צדקה in Mal. 3:20 (see further the commentary on 811: 4-5 and 812: 2).

Misor and Sydyk discover the use of salt. This has usually been explained by reference to the Biblical verses (e.g. Nu. 18: 19) associating salt with a covenant. Misor and Sydyk, as gods of justice, are related to covenants, hence the discovery attributed is appropriate.[201]

809: 9-11 ἀπὸ Μισὼρ-ἐκάλεσαν

Misor's son Taautos and his invention have been discussed at length in Chapter Five, pp. 67-72. Taautos' invention, writing, is here explicitly described as alphabetic.[202]

809: 11-12 ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Συδὺκ-εὗρον

From the perspective of Greek mythology Philo has properly associated the Dioskouri with the invention of a boat. Williams has shown the aptness of Philo's text by pointing to the Dioskouroi as patrons of mariners in Greek mythology.[203]

Philo has equated four sets of gods, Dioskouroi, Kabeiroi, Korybants, and Samothracians. The identification of Kabeiroi with Samothracians is not particularly instructive since the Kabeiroi could always be called by that name. A major center of their worship was Samothrace.[204] The equation of Kabeiroi with Dioskouroi is probably due to their both being gods of mariners.[205] The final identification, that of Korybants, is characteristic of the Hellenistic period.[206] In any case when Philo next refers to the sons of Sydyk in 813: 1 he simply calls them Kabeiroi.

---

[199] First pointed out by Clemen, p. 55.

[200] See Contenau, *Everyday Life*, pp. 249-250.

[201] Explanation first proposed by Gruppe, p. 355 with whom Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," pp. 62-63 agrees; Clapham, pp. 130-131. Cf. Clemen, pp. 55-56.

[202] Taautos' invention is both the first kind of writing and alphabetic.

[203] Williams, p. 167. See also Rose, *Handbook*, p. 230.

[204] See Guthrie, "Cabiri," p. 150. The conclusion that the Kabeiroi were of Semitic origin, and that their name is to be understood from כבירים = "mighty ones," has been proposed in the past, and has been revived by Astour in Chapter Two of his *HS*. This conclusion, even if correct, adds little if anything to our understanding of Philo's text, since the Kabeiroi are barely discussed, and merely identified as Samothracians etc. I have therefore not considered this conclusion in my comments on Philo's text.

[205] Guthrie, "Cabiri," p. 150.

809: 12-13 ἐκ τούτων-ἐπῳδάς

The descendants of the Dioskouroi etc. seemingly made these first medical discoveries. Put another way, the inventors of these skills were Sydyk's grandchildren. This seems to contradict the statement in 813: 1-2 which makes Asklepios Sydyk's son.[207] Either Philo or Eusebius was sloppy in his citation or we have here another indication that Philo used more than one source in preparing his *Phoenician History*.[208]

iv

As presented by Eusebius, undoubtedly following Philo, the fragments in this chapter commence where the cosmogony (discussed in the previous chapter) ended. The world and some animals already exist, the origin of human life is the next topic. We have seen however that these fragments actually begin with another, independent cosmogony. Kolpia, Baau, Aion, Protogonos, Genos, Genea, the forms of fire and the mountain ranges were originally part of a cosmogonic tradition. After the mountain ranges Philo leaves cosmogonic traditions and begins to present material on culture heroes and their inventions, deities and their functions for a non-Euhemerist. This shift in content is confirmed by a shift in form of filiation.

In the previous chapter we had no clues of the provenance of the verse cosmogony. The material in this chapter, however, seems to come from Tyre. The cosmogonic portions are quite similar to the cosmogony ascribed to Mochos who may have been a Tyrian. The story of the giants has a faint echo in Tyrian mythology preserved by Nonnus, and the setting of the quarrel of Samemroumos and Ousoos is Tyre.

---

[206] *Ibid.* Clapham's comments on the Dioskouroi and Kabeiroi are based on his consistent attempt to find all the figures in Philo in Ugaritic sources. Thus they are identified with *šḫr*, *šlm* and their five brothers of *UT* 52: 57. Clapham, pp. 145-146. The flaw in this proposal remains the same as with other of Clapham's suggestions discussed in detail above (e.g. Appendix to Chapter Six): Clapham's *a priori* assumption that everything in Philo has a Ugaritic source is untenable.

[207] Cf. Williams, p. 167.

[208] See above, p. 167.

The Tyrian material upon which Philo drew was not a single source. There are several repetitions and apparent contradictions even within the fragments discussed in this chapter. Philo or his source(s) not only combined the traditions of various cities, but also assembled different myths in circulation within each city. Philo's work is a composite.[209] This conclusion is old in the history of scholarship on the fragments, going back at least to the end of the nineteenth century. One consequence of this fact has not been noted. In analyzing the god Agros, the inscription to Jupiter Beelseddi was mentioned. Yet, if one looks closely, Philo's god seems relatively minor, while Beelseddi was important enough to the dedicator of the inscription to be equated with Roman Jupiter. How is this contrast to be explained? I would suggest that it is an inevitable product of the attempt to unify and systematize the traditions of the various cities. That is, in the process of compiling the myths Philo (and perhaps his sources) were forced to construct a hierarchy in which a god's place might be lower than in the estimation of the god's devoted worshippers. Agros = Beelseddi is one example of this process. Other examples will be noted in succeeding chapters.

The major purpose of the commentary, as outlined in the introduction, was to discover the gods behind Philo's "mortals" and the functions behind the "inventions.' On the whole this purpose has been achieved. Virtually all the mortals emerge as Phoenician deities even when they are called by Greek names only—in most such cases the Phoenician original can be readily supplied. Even in the few cases where it was impossible to supply a Phoenician original this was probably due to lack of information, rather than the absence of such an original.

Finally, the date of the traditions preserved by Philo is certainly not in the second millennium B.C. Philo's Chousor works iron, as we have seen, excluding the possibility of a bronze age source. Some points in the fragments date to Philo's own day such as the equation of Baalshemem and the sun, while others may represent some direct Greek influence such as Geinos Autochthon. The conclusions of the previous chapters concerning the date of the material in Philo are therefore not contradicted. In fact whatever is datable confirms these conclusions.

---

[209] Troiani has also emphasized the nature of Philo's work as a composite. See e.g. Troiani, pp. 108, 131, 132, 142, 149. See also Teixidor, *The Pagan God*, p. 48.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE LIFE OF KRONOS

i

The fragments to be discussed in this chapter center around Kronos. He is the main character in the events narrated and the section concludes with Eusebius' sneer at the insignificance of his life, and at the stories told about him by the Greeks (811: 20-23). Since Bunsen, almost all commentators have realized that these passages form a distinct unit which differs from the sections which precede and follow.[1] Inventions may be mentioned in passing in this section (i.e. 810: 5-7 and 810: 28-29), but the fundamental concern is no longer to narrate the history of discoveries (as it was in the fragments considered in Chapter Seven).

Philo's Euhemerism, consistently applied in the fragments discussed in the previous chapter, is still apparent. The section begins with a reminder that the actors were mortal: τις Ἐλιοῦν a certain Elioun (809: 14). There are some apparent lapses, such as θεοὺς in 810: 22 and θεὸς Οὐρανὸς in 810: 28, but as will become clearer (see especially the commentary on 812: 18-27) Philo's Euhemerism remains dominant. This conclusion is confirmed by the numerous minor agreements between Philo, Euhemerus, and D. Skytobrachion which will be noted.

Philo has also continued his usual practice of identifying equivalent Phoenician and Greek gods: El = Kronos (809: 22); Melqart = Herakles (811: 10-11). Thus even when Philo gives only the Greek name of a god it is possible if not likely that he is really thinking and writing about the Phoenician equivalent.

Kronos' adventures as told by Philo closely resemble accounts in Greek myth, and Hesiod in particular. Philo recognizes these similarities and has a theory of his own to explain them (813: 4-22), a theory which is at the core of the scholarly debate concerning the fragments. I propose to note the similarities and differences between Philo and Hesiod in this chapter but to defer discussing their significance until the commentary on the passages in which Philo develops his theory.

---

[1] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 827. Among more recent scholars see Clemen, p. 58, or Williams, p. 5. Bunsen also suggested that the original version of these stories might have been a cosmogonic myth; we would call it a cosmogony by succession.

ii

Translation of Texts Discussed

(809: 14) At the same time as these [last] is born a certain Elioun, called Hypsistos and a female called Berouth, and they lived near Byblos. (809: 15) From these is begotten Epigeios Autochthon, whom they later called Ouranos, so [beautiful] that from him the element above us, on account of its exceeding beauty, is called Ouranos. (809: 17) To him a sister is begotten of the above-mentioned parents and was correspondingly called Ge, and on account of [her] beauty, he says, they named the earth, which also bears this name, after her. (809: 19) But their father Hypsistos, having died in an encounter with wild animals, was sanctified, and his children offered libations and sacrifices to him. (809: 21) And Ouranos, succeeding to his father's sovereignty, takes his sister Ge to wife, and has four children by her: El or Kronos, and Baitylos, and Dagon (who is *Siton*), and Atlas. (809: 23) And Ouranos had many descendants from other wives. Therefore Ge, being angry and jealous, abused Ouranos [with the result] that they even were separated from each other. (809: 25) And Ouranos, though he left her, coming to her by force whenever he wished and having sexual relations with her, would leave again. (810: 1) And he also used to attempt to kill the children born from her. (810: 2) But Ge defended herself many times, having found herself allies. (810: 2) Then Kronos, advancing into manhood (using Hermes Trismegistos as adviser and ally—for he was Kronos' secretary) punishes his father Ouranos and avenges his mother. (810: 5) To Kronos are born children—Persephone and Athena. (810: 6) The former died a virgin. With the advice of Athena and Hermes, Kronos fashioned from iron a sickle and spear. (810: 7) Then Hermes, speaking magical words to Kronos' allies, created in [them] the desire to fight against Ouranos on behalf of Ge. (810: 9) And thus Kronos, meeting Ouranos in war drove him out of power and succeeded to the kingship. (810: 10) In the battle the beloved concubine of Ouranos was captured. [She] was pregnant, and Kronos gave her to Dagon for wife. (810: 12) She gave birth at his home to the [child] which she bore from Ouranos and whom she called Demarous. (810: 14) Following these [events] Kronos builds a wall around his dwelling and founds the first city in Phoenicia, Byblos. After this, Kronos, suspecting his own brother Atlas, on the advice of Hermes, throwing him into the depths of the earth, buried him. (810: 16) At [about] this time the descendants of the Dioskouroi, having constructed rafts and boats, set sail and, cast ashore near Mt. Kassios, consecrated a shrine at that spot. (810: 18) The allies of El [i.e.] of Kronos were nicknamed Elohim, as those called after Kronos might be called Kronioi. And Kronos had a son Sadidos whom, because he suspected him, he killed with his own iron [weapon] and deprived him of his life, becoming the executioner of his son. (810: 21) Similarly, he also cut off the head of his own daughter, so that all the gods were panic stricken at Kronos' disposition. (810: 23) Some time later, Ouranos, being in exile, sends his virgin daughter Astarte with two other of her sisters, Rhea and Dione, to destroy Kronos by treachery, and Kronos, having captured them, made them his wedded wives even though they were his sisters. (810 : 26) Ouranos, having learned this, sends Heimarmene and Horas together with other allies [to make war] against Kronos. (810: 27) But Kronos won them over and kept them on his side (810: 28) And moreover, he says, the god Ouranos devised baetyls, [that is] he made rocks which were alive. (810: 29) To Kronos there were born from Astarte seven daughters, [the] Titanids or Artemids, and also to him from Rhea seven boys, the youngest of whom was consecrated as soon as he was born. (811: 3) And from Dione girls ... and again from Astarte two boys, Pothos and Eros. (811: 4) And Dagon, since he discovered [the cultivation of] grain and [the] plough was called Zeus Arotrios. One of the Titanids, cohabiting with Sydyk called the Just, gave birth to Asklepios (811: 6) In addition, three children were born to Kronos in Peraia: Kronos, having the same name as his father, and Zeus Belos, and Apollo (811: 7) Roughly contemporary with these are Pontos, and Typho and Nereus (the father of Pontos and son of Belos).

(811: 9) From Pontos is born Sidon who on account of her exceeding fine voice first discovered unaccompanied hymns—and Poseidon. And to Demarous is born Melkathros, who is [called] Herakles. (811: 11) Then Ouranos again makes war on Pontos and, having withdrawn attaches [himself] to Demarous; and Demarous attacks Pontos, (811: 12) but Pontos puts him to flight and Demarous vowed an offering for [his] escape. (811: 13) In the thirty-second year of his dominion and reign El (that is Kronos), having ambushed his father Ouranos in a certain inland spot and getting him in his power, cuts off his genitals near springs and rivers. Ouranos was there sacrificed and his spirit was finished off, (811: 17) and the blood of his genitals dripped into the springs and the waters of the rivers; and the place is pointed out until today.

(Eusebius)

(811: 20) So great indeed, are the stories about Kronos! And such are the revered [facts] of the life (so vaunted by the Greeks!) of Kronos' contemporaries, whom, they say, were "the first and golden race of articulate men." (811: 22) That blessed happiness of the ancients!

iii

809: 14 τις

This word, as Bernays first noticed, reminds the reader of the mortality of Elioun (and by implication of all his descendants).[2] It is a sign of Philo's Euhemerism; all these "mortals," (El = Kronos, Athena, etc.), would be considered gods by a non-Euhemerist. If the usage were normal *tis* would also indicate that this Elioun was not the only one called by that name, but the usage is not normal and may be deliberately impertinent, as if one were to say, "a certain Jehovah." As a matter of fact the term Elioun had been used of several deities (see below) but Philo may not have known this fact so it does not settle the question of what he intended *tis* to imply.

809: 14 Ἑλιοῦν

---

[2] Bernays *ap.* Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 826, n. 16.

The readings of the MSS. are all incorrect; the correct name must be Ἐλιοῦν.[3] This Biblical name (see below) was evidently strange to the copyists of the *P.E.* Philo, who correctly rendered the name as *hypsistos*, cannot have been responsible for the error.

Elioun is clearly a transliteration of Hebrew עליון or Aramaic עלין.[4] Although the word is not attested in known Phoenician inscriptions it must have existed in Phoenician.[5] Philo has rendered the semitic word properly as ὕψιστος.[6]

Literally, both *Elioun* and *hypsistos* are not proper nouns but adjectives meaning the "high (or highest) one." As such they could be applied to any god who dwells on high,[7] (Philo's specification that this one was "called *hypsistos*," might be distinction, but more likely is mere translation).[8] The Bible and inscriptions show that עליון was applied to at least three gods.

One of these was El. In South Arabic inscriptions the god El is called *ʿly*, an epithet apparently reserved for him.[9] Genesis 14: 18 speaks of אל עליון who is קנה שמים וארץ.[10] The "High One" of this verse is the creator god, and the epithet used to describe him as creator god is almost the same as the one applied to El in KAI 26 A III, line 18.[11] Finally, in the Sfire treaty, KAI 222A, line 11, the phrase אל ועלין appears.[12]

Another god called Elioun was apparently Baal. In a passage of the Keret epic Baal and his *mṭr* are twice in parallelism with *ʿly* and his

---

[3] See the critical apparatus in Mras, or Williams, p. 96. Mras inexplicably adopts the reading Ἐλιοῦμ, while Williams has *Elioun*.

[4] See KAI 222 A*, line 11.

[5] Ugaritic, at least, has *ʿly*, Gordon, *UT*, #1855, p. 456.

[6] For עלין = ὕψιστος see Gen. 14: 18 LXX.

[7] See Williams, pp. 167-168.

[8] Cf. Della Vida, "El Elyon," pp. 2-4.

[9] Lack, "Elyon," p. 49.

[10] Cf. Genesis 14: 22 in which *YHWH El Elyon* appears. One should omit YHWH following the LXX and Peshitta. See Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, p. 46, n. 12.

[11] See Cassuto, "El Elyon," p. 287. On the identity of *elyon* in Deut. 32: 8 see below Chapter Nine, p. 217, n. 9.

[12] Cassuto, *ibid.*, argues that this name is to be understood as a double name, like the Ugaritic double name *kṯr wḫss*—El and Elioun are not distinguished but are two names of the same god. Cross, "Yahweh and the Patriarchs," pp. 242-243 proposes a similar interpretation.

mṭr.[13] The evidence from the Book of Hosea also supports the notion that Baal was called the "High One." This Book is a long polemic against Baal worship. In both 7: 16 and 11: 7 the text should be corrected to introduce the god עלי which stands for Baal.[14]

Finally, the Bible repeatedly calls YHWH *Elioun*, sometimes using *Elioun* by itself to refer to him.[15] It also uses *Elioun* to modify *Elohim* when this stands as a substitute (?) for YHWH.[16]

Consequently, the fact that Philo uses *Elioun* almost as if it were a proper name, without taking the trouble to specify which "high(est) god" he meant, probably indicates that in his time and region the old variety was less apparent and the word was specific. Its reference may be indicated by the dedications to Zeus Hypsistos in several Greek inscriptions of Phoenicia,[17] and many Greek inscriptions at Palmyra; a bilingual Palmyrene inscription discovered in 1928 identifies this Zeus as Baalshamem.[18] This Elioun would thus refer to a god who controlled winds and rains.[19]

Baalshamem was a senior god at both Tyre and Byblos, as we learn from the Baalu treaty and KAI 4. This aspect of Baalshamem might explain Philo's making Elioun the first in the divine succession. Whatever the explanation, there is an important difference between Philo and Ugarit. Ugaritic El is first of the divine rulers,[20] while Philo has

---

[13] Gordon, *UT*, 126: III: 5-8. The text reads as follows: *lars m(ṭ)r bʿl wlšd mṭr ʿly. nʿm larṣ mṭr bʿ(l) wlšd mṭr ʿly*. It is clear that *bʿl* and *ʿly* are in parallelism, as was first noticed by Eissfeldt, *RS*, pp. 114-116 and further developed by Lack, "Elyon," p. 48. Lack recognizes that Eissfeldt's suggestion that Ugaritic *aliyn* and עליון are variants is unnecessary.

[14] These emendations, proposed by Nyberg, *ap.* Lack, "Elyon," p. 48, are quite attractive and have been adopted in the NEB. To these emendations should be added the suggestion of Cross, *Studies*, pp. 223-224, to understand Deut. 33: 12 as follows: ידיד ה ישכן־לבטח // עלי חפף עליו כל היום ובין כתיפיו שכן. "The High One" may also be intended in Ps. 13: 6 on which see Dahood, *Psalms*, Vol. 1, p. 47. Dahood has argued for the general principle that עלי is often intended in Psalms. See *ibid.*, Vol. 1, pp. 45-46 and Vol. 3, p. xix.

[15] See e.g. Ps. 18: 14; 21: 8; 83: 19; 91: 9; 92: 2. In all these verses עליון//YHWH.

[16] See e.g. Ps. 53: 3; 78: 56. Cf. Ps. 46: 5; 50: 14 where עליון//*elohim*.

[17] See the texts cited by Lack, "Elyon," p. 53.

[18] *Ibid.*

[19] *Ibid.* See also Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Etudes*, p. 37, and Chapter Seven, pp. 149-151. Cf. Loewenstamm, "Philon," p. 323.

[20] See Pope, *El*, pp. 49-58. Cf. Oldenburg, *Conflict*, pp. 9-10.

Elioun-Hypsistos two generations older than Kronos-El. It is therefore clear that Philo is following a non-Ugaritic mythological tradition.[21]

One aspect of Philo's description of Elioun remains puzzling. Elioun-Hypsistos died in an encounter with wild beasts (809: 19-20). This form of death seems reminiscent, as Bunsen realized, of the myths of dying and reviving gods.[22] This would seem closer to the myths of Ugaritic Baal.[23] Perhaps the difficulty should be explained as caused by the confusion of several gods called Elioun.

809: 15 Βηρούθ

Berouth has been variously identified. Bochart connected her with בעל ברית of Jud. 8: 33 and 9: 4, 46,[24] but it is hard to see the relevance of the biblical god to Philo.[25] Du Mesnil du Buisson suggested that she is the eponymous goddess of the city of Beirut.[26] This is difficult at best because the city reappears in the fragments in 812: 13 as Βηρυτόν. Also Berouth is said to have lived with Elioun περὶ Βύβλον (809: 15). It is probable, of course, that a personification of the city was worshipped in Beirut, as in most hellenistic cities, although we have no evidence of such worship in Beirut.[27] But the difference of spelling and—more serious—of location remain. We therefore prefer an interpretation of Berouth first proposed by Dodwell and developed by Albright,[28]—that it is a transliteration of Hebrew (and Phoenician?)[29] בארות, the name of the goddess of wells, the subterranean sources of water, a perfect consort of Elioun the god of rain.[30]

---

[21] This is only one of several contrasts between Philo and Ugaritic myth which will be noted. See e.g. the commentary on 812: 18-27.

[22] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 827, n. 1. See also Eissfeldt, *RS*, p. 114.

[23] See Gaster, *Thespis*, pp. 124-129. Cf. Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Etudes*, pp. 34-37.

[24] Bochart, p. 705.

[25] On Baal Berit see e.g. Cassuto, "Baal Berit," p. 286.

[26] Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Etudes*, p. 31. For a more sober version of the same argument see Loewenstamm, "Philon," p. 316.

[27] Du Mesnil du Buisson, *ibid.*, p. 71 compounds the difficulty of his theory by admitting that Elioun and Asherah—whom he supposes to have been the original goddess of the city—were not worshipped in Beirut of Philo's day and by supposing that Philo's information about them must have been archaeological.

[28] Dodwell, p. 46; Albright, "Aleyan Baal and Mot," p. 190.

[29] See Harris, *Grammar*, s.v. באר, p. 85, citing Stephanus of Byzantium, who gives Βηρ = well, as the source of the name Beirut. Stephanus also cites from the *Phoinikika* of Hestaios an alternative explanation, that in Phoenician Βηρούτι means strength. See *FGrH* 786.

[30] Cf. Gen. 7: 11. See also below p. 197.

809: 15 περὶ Βύβλον

Throughout this section Byblos has primacy. It is therefore likely that Byblian myths were the sources of the information in this section of the fragments. Here we learn that Elioun and Berouth lived near Byblos.[31]

809: 15-17 ἐξ ὧν-οὐρανόν

Three pieces of information are given (1) that the male child of Elioun and Berouth was called Epigeios Autochthon, Terrestial native; (2) that he was later called Ouranos; and (3) that Ouranos was so beautiful that his name was applied to the beautiful sky. Of these points the third is the clearest. Philo has already implied (805: 5-7) that the ancients used the names of kings for parts of the universe. We are now given an example of this principle: the sky was called Ouranos after the beautiful mortal named Ouranos.[32]

As to the second piece of information, the origin of the name Ouranos, and when and by whom it was first used are unexplained in the fragments. Changes of name in the Bible are represented as significant. When Abram's name is changed to Abraham this is said to be a sign of the covenant between YHWH and Abraham, and of the promise of progeny.[33] The change of Epigeios' name to Ouranos may have had some significance—this seems likely because the change involves contradiction; the terrestial native becomes a celestial being —but the fragments give no clue. Perhaps part of the explanation is in a fragment of Euhemerus, whom Philo followed. Euhemerus also suggests that Ouranos originally had some other name: πρῶτον θυσίαις τιμῆσαι τοὺς οὐρανίους θεούς. δὶο καὶ Οὐρανον προσαγορευθῆναι, "he was the first to honor the heavenly gods with sacrifices, wherefore he was called Ouranos."[34] Philo's name change might thus have been inspired by Euhemerus'. That this interpretation is correct is confirmed by Dionysios Skytobrachion. He speaks of Ouranos' great wisdom on astronomical matters, and notes that his name was therefore properly applied to the sky.[35] Dionysios Skytobrachion does not talk of Ouranos originally having a different name, as do Philo and Euhemerus, but he does mention that Ge's name was originally different.[36] When Euhemerus, Philo, and Dionysios Skytobrachion agree, we clearly have one of the commonplaces of Euhemeristic historiography.

---

[31] Du Mesnil du Buisson attempts to avoid this difficulty, *Etudes*, pp. 32-33, by supposing that Philo added the reference to Byblos to this Beirutian tradition because he was confused by the temple of Zeus Hypsistos at Byblos.

[32] Jacoby, in the critical apparatus *ad loc.* proposes reorganizing the text. The order in Philo is now intelligible and no reorganization is necessary.

[33] See Gen. Ch. 18.

[34] *FGrH* 63 F 2,6.

Epigeios Autochthon, the original name, is even more obscure. It is hard to see what Phoenician title it translates. Lagrange and Williams both believe that this name is somehow connected with Hesiod's *Theogony* in which Ouranos is born from Ge (Philo's Ouranos is Epigeios).[37] This connection is open to some doubt as Philo's Ouranos and Ge are siblings, the children of Elioun and Berouth, while Hesiod's Ouranos and Ge are parent and child.[38]

Ouranos would obviously be שמם in Phoenician.[39] Philo's "mortal" Ouranos (and Ge below) were presumably, as usual, gods. The worship of such gods by Phoenicians is suggested by the Sfire treaty where Heaven and Earth, [... שמי]ן וארק, are invoked as witnesses.[40] A Ugaritic text speaks of *arṣ w šmm š*, "Earth and Heaven (to receive an offering of) a male head of small cattle."[41] Another Phoenician text also speaks of Heaven and Earth as gods.[42] Philo is therefore correct in speaking of the "mortals" Ouranos and Ge—these were gods for non-Euhemeristic Phoenicians.

---

[35] *FGrH* 32 F 7,56,5.

[36] *FGrH* 32 F 7,57,2. Cf. Troiani, p. 158.

[37] Lagrange, p. 354 and Williams, p. 168, based on Hesiod, *Th.* 126ff.

[38] One is tempted to suppose that some similar legend lies behind Philo's *Epigeios Authochthon* and Gen. 2: 7.

[39] See Harris, *Grammar*, s.v. שמם, p. 151.

[40] The Lake and its sources, Day and Night, and other witnesses are invoked in the Sfire treaty. It is hard to be certain all of these were gods. Cf. Deut. 32: 1 where Heaven and Earth are invoked, more as eternal than as gods. Polybius 7,9,2 includes Heaven and Earth among the witnesses of the treaty between Philip V and Carthage. Perhaps these gods appear as gods of the Greeks; See Clemen, pp. 61-62.

[41] Text cited and translated in Gordon, *UT*, #367, p. 376.

[42] Cross, "Phoenician Incantation," p. 44, line 13.

809: 17-19 γεννᾶται-γῆν

Ge's name was never changed it seems,[43] but her name was also applied to a part of the physical world—the earth. In Phoenician she would be ארץ.[44] Philo has Ouranos and Ge as a pair, much like in Hesiod and the texts discussed above.

809: 19-20 ὁ δε-ἐτέλεσαν

The manner of Elioun's death and its significance have been discussed above, p. 186. After his death Elioun was worshipped by his children. Once again Philo is consistent: the manner of worship corresponds with his description of the religious practices of the most ancient peoples. (805: 25ff.).[45]

809: 21-22 παραλαβὼν-Γῆν

Ouranos and Ge, full brother and sister, marry. Marriages between brothers and sisters also occur in Greek and Ugaritic myth, e.g. between Zeus and Hera or Baal and Anat.[46] Such marriages also occurred in real life. Not to mention the Ptolemies, the Eshmunazar inscription records the king's ancestors and those of his wife.[47] Eshmunazar's parents were clearly brother and sister.

809: 22-23 καὶ ποιεῖται-῎Ατλαντα

Ouranos and Ge had four children: Kronos = El, the first of the children, is the main character of this section. El is the head of the Ugaritic pantheon, the creator of mankind, and ultimate authority. He lives in the depths of the sea together with his consort.[48] El is also mentioned in several Phoenician and Aramaic inscriptions.[49] It would thus seem that he continued to occupy an important place in the religion of the later periods, after Ugarit. Philo's identification of

---

[43] Cf. Dionysios Skytobrachion *FGrH* 32 F 7,57,2 where Ge originally had a different name.

[44] See Harris, *Grammar*, s.v. ארץ, p. 81. Ge appears on several Syrian inscribed mosaics of the fourth to sixth centuries A.D.: IGLS 751, 798, 1013, 1026. Any connection, however, between Philo's Ge and that of these inscriptions is highly unlikely.

[45] Cf. Chapter Seven, p. 164.

[46] See Van Selms, *Marriage*, pp. 69ff.

[47] KAI 14, lines 13-15. See the comments in KAI *ad loc.*, Vol. 2, p. 22.

[48] See Chapter Six, p. 106, n. 41.

[49] See KAI 26 A III, line 18 and KAI 222 A I, line 11.

El with Greek Kronos is not confirmed by any bilingual inscriptions but is certainly correct.[50] The same identification is found in Damascius and Diodorus.[51] Philo will tell stories about his Kronos = El much like the Greek stories of Kronos.

Baitylos poses many problems, chief of which is his relationship to the betyls later invented by Ouranos in his war against Kronos (810: 28). It would seem that they must be different: Baitylos is a "mortal," hence a god, the betyls stone objects. Yet the names are so similar and the possibilities of confusion numerous. These problems will be discussed in greater detail in the comments on 810: 28.

Dagon, the third of the children, is translated by Philo as Greek *Siton* or corn. Philo understood the god's name as Hebrew, Phoenician, and Ugaritic דגן. *Dgn* both as the name for corn and as a deity appears in all three languages and cultures.[52] Consistent with these facts is the information Philo gives in 811: 4ff. concerning Dagon's discovery of (the cultivation of) grain and of the plow.

Atlas is a problem of a different order. Philo gives only the Greek name and not a Phoenician one, although by analogy with the others one would expect Atlas to have been a Phoenician god. More important, however, is the fact that Philo disagrees with Hesiod (*Th.* 507ff; 746ff.) in making Atlas Kronos' brother. D. Skytobrachion also makes Atlas and Kronos brothers.[53] We have here another of the agreements between Philo and Euhemeristic historians.

809: 23-25 καὶ-ἀλλήλων

In addition to these children by Ge, Ouranos had other children by other wives. Again the contrast with Hesiod and D. Skytobrachion is informative. Hesiod's Ouranos was married only to Ge, but Ouranos of D. Skytobrachion had at least four more wives.[54] Philo and

---

[50] See Güterbock, *Kumarbi*, p. 112 and Williams, pp. 169-170.

[51] Damascius, *Vita Isidori* 115; D.S. 2,30,3. Kronos of IGLS 2740 is also El.

[52] See Harris, *Grammar*, s.v. דגן, p. 95 and Gordon, *UT*, #644, p. 384. There is also, of course, the temple of *dgn* of Ugarit. Bunsen, Vol. 5, pp. 828-829, n. 2 realized the significance of our passage for the debate over the identity of the god mentioned in I Sam. 5. See also Dhorme, "Dagon," p. 132 & Oldenburg, *Conflict*, pp. 47-57.

[53] *FGrH* 32 F 7,60, 1. Cf. Clemen, pp. 68-69 and Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 65.

[54] *FGrH* 32 F 7,57,1. Cf. Teixidor, "BES 1971," #101, p. 474.

D. Skytobrachion are again following a common (presumably Euhemeristic) tradition, one which differs from the standard set by Hesiod.

Philo's explanation of the cause of conflict between Ouranos and Ge also differs from Hesiod's. Hesiod's Ouranos fights with Ge because their children were most fearful (δεινότατοι), hence Ouranos hated them, kept them inside Ge, and did not let them be born. Ge consequently suffered and devised a punishment for Ouranos.[55] Philo explains the conflict as caused by jealousy, an explanation I have found nowhere in Greek or near eastern sources. This looks like an attempt to humanize the myth, consistent with Philo's Euhemerism. Hesiod, the Greek, more closely resembles the Enuma Elish than does Philo.[56]

809: 25-810: 2 ὁ δὲ Οὐρανὸς-συλλεξαμένην

The explanations of the relations between Ouranos and Ge continue to be in human terms. Ouranos provokes Ge by forcibly having sexual relations with her and also by attempting to kill their children. These elements are not in Hesiod's version of the dispute between Ouranos and Ge, where Ouranos seems to force the children back into Ge (lines 155-160)—clearly a mythological account. Philo's Ouranos merely wants to kill them after their birth.[57] Again, the course of events would seem to have been rationalized.

810: 2-5 εἰς ἄνδρας-τῇ μητρί

Kronos becomes the leader of Ge and her party in the wars against Ouranos. Most of this section of the fragments is devoted to a description of these wars, which last for at least thirty-two years. By contrast, although the Greeks told much about the wars of Kronos and the Titans against Zeus, and of Zeus against the Giants,[58] there is little in Greek sources about the war of Ouranos and Kronos other than the account of the original castration. Having been deposed, Ouranos continues to give oracles to his descendants, but he does not attempt to regain the kingship.[59] There are thus few Greek parallels to the central portion of Philo's life of Kronos. In Phoenician terms these stories are also disturbing. In Ugaritic it seems that El is the first divine king; he may have younger competitors, but has no older rivals from whom he originally took the kingship.[60] Yet Philo tells a long story of the taking of the kingship from Ouranos by Kronos = El. These difficulties may be a clue to the nature of Philo's sources and the validity of his theories.

---

[55] Hesiod, *Th.* 154ff. The interpretation followed is that of West, *Theogony*, pp. 213-215.

[56] Noticed by West, *Theogony*, p. 213.

[57] Cf. Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca* 1,4, where Ouranos throws his children into Tartaros.

[58] See Vian, *Guerre des Geants*, pp. 170-174.

[59] Hesiod, *Th.* 463-465; 888ff.; 468ff. See Walcot, *Hesiod*, p. 5.

Hermes Trismegistos is Kronos' secretary. This passage is the earliest mention of the title Trismegistos.[61] Hermes clearly stands for Taautos, introduced and discussed earlier, and his functions in this passage correspond to the previous description.[62] It is appropriate for the inventor of writing to be the secretary, as it is appropriate for Taautos = Thoth to be a god who can speak magical words (810: 7-9).[63] The use of Hermes, rather than Taautos, is however odd. Equally difficult is Hermes as counselor of Kronos, an idea known from Greek Egypt;[64] Ugaritic El did not have a cunning counselor.[65] The possibility of this being a borrowing from post-Ptolemaic Egypt is quite high. Such borrowing from Alexandria would make borrowing from classical Greek sources all the more likely.

810: 5-7 Κρόνῳ-δόρυ

Kronos has two daughters, Persephone and Athena—their mother(s) not mentioned. In Greek mythology both these goddesses were children of Zeus, which suggests that Philo is not thinking of the Greek Persephone and Athena but of the Phoenician goddesses identified with the Greek goddesses.

Against the supposition of a Phoenician origin for Persephone is Lagrange's conjecture that the Greek story of her rape by Hades may explain Philo's statement that she died a virgin.[66] But virgin heroines —probably virgin deities—were not unknown in Palestine (Jud. 11: 34-40) and there was a cult of Persephone in Samaria.[67] Clemen rightly rejects Lagrange's conjecture but admits ignorance as to the Phoenician equivalent.[68] Lokkegaard is less hesitant and thinks that Persephone in Philo equals Ugaritic *Arṣiyu Bt Y'dr.*[69] She, according to Lokkegaard, is one of Baal's nymphs, yet when Baal goes to the netherworld he takes his whole entourage with him (67:V:6-11) but *not* her. This, Lokkegaard argues, shows that she is already in the earth, that she is some sort of earth goddess (as her name suggests), who may therefore be identified with Persephone.[70] Lokkegaard's suggestion is possible and even attractive. It cannot however be proven given the lack of documentation.

---

[60] See Cross, "Yahweh and the Patriarchs," p. 241.

[61] See Nock, in the introduction to his edition of the *Corpus Hermeticum*, p. iv.

[62] See Chapter Five, pp. 69-72.

[63] See Boylan, *Thoth*, pp. 93-94.

[64] Hecataeus, *FGrH* 264 F 25 = D.S. 1,16,2. Hecataeus' Hermes advises Osiris. See Clemen, pp. 63-64.

[65] In Ugarit, *kṯr wḫss* advises Baal. Clapham has attempted to merge the advisors *kṯr wḫss* to Hermes = Taautos. On Clapham's attempt see Chapter Five, p. 72, n. 30 & Chapter Seven, p. 167, n. 151.

Philo's Athena is more readily identified. Gruppe already realized the significance of the bilingual Cypriot inscription dedicated to ענת מעז חים in Phoenician, and Athena Soteria Nike in Greek.[71] The identification of Athena and Anat is apt as both are goddesses of battle.[72] If Philo followed the same tradition as this inscription (a likely assumption since Philo's identifications always agree with those of the inscriptions)[73] he would have intended Anat when he wrote Athena.[74]

---

66 Lagrange, p. 387. For the historiography of interpretations of this passage see Clemen, p. 68.

67 See Vincent, "Hélène à Samaria," p. 221. See also IGLS 2978 and the discussion there.

68 Clemen, p. 68.

69 See Gordon, *UT*, #376, p. 376.

70 Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 65. Oldenburg, *Conflict*, p. 77, n. 2 agrees with Lokkegaard. Cf. Albright, *YGC*, p. 128. If Albright's analysis of Pidraya is correct she might be an equivalent of Persephone.

71 KAI 42. Gruppe, p. 405.

72 On Anat see Gordon, *UT*, 'nt: II: 5ff; on Athena, Rose, *Handbook*, pp. 107-112. Cf. Du Mesnil du Buisson, *NE* pp. 48-55.

73 See Chapter Four, p. 45, n. 24.

74 Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 65 inexplicably rejects the identification of Athena and Anat on the grounds that there is "no certain reason for Philo to undertake the same identification" (as the inscription). But is it not much more plausible for Philo to have made the same identification as the inscription, particularly when his identifications always agree with those of the inscriptions? The identification proposed by Lokkegaard, with Padriyu of Ugarit, is much less likely than Gruppe's. It must be

Kronos prepares for battle with Ouranos and fashions a sickle and spear of iron with the help of Athena and Hermes. The way in which these weapons are introduced suggests there must be something special about them, like the weapons *kṯr wḫss* makes for Baal, or Hephaistos for Achilles.[75] The extant fragments do not narrate Kronos' use of these weapons. The parallels with Hesiod suggest that the sickle was used in castrating Ouranos (811: 13-19).[76] In Philo, however, it has no function, though the castration story is not suppressed but told in a different connection and with different details. Does this indicate that Philo took the sickle from Hesiod? But he says nothing either of the function of the spear, which is not in Hesiod. Since sickle and spear are mentioned together, as if connected, the likelihood is that both came from a story considerably different than Hesiod's.

Athena and Hermes advise Kronos in fashioning these weapons. Why Hermes = Taautos = Thoth was competent to advise in making weapons is not clear—perhaps, as god of wisdom, he knew everything, or, as god of magic, he could give the weapons special magical powers. Athena knew something about spears (the spear was one of her attributes),[77] but it is more likely that she functions here as goddess of wisdom, including the handicrafts and prudent advice. This would be the role of Greek Athena, and not that of the Ugaritic Anat who fights for her brother Baal but does not help fashion his armor—that is done by *kṯr wḫss*.[78]

810: 7-9 εἶτα-Γῆς

Hermes' role was discussed above, p. 192.

810: 9-10 καὶ οὕτως-διεδέξατο

Ouranos loses his kingship to Kronos in the battle. Ouranos, however, does not disappear from the scene after his defeat but continues to attempt to win his place back. He is not castrated and killed until

---

added that Athena is given dominion over Attica in 812: 5, an indication that Philo is thinking in Greek terms as well as Phoenician. This is discussed more fully in the commentary on 812: 5.

[75] Gordon, *UT*, 68: 12ff. and Homer, *Il.* 18, 476ff. See also commentary on 804: 25.

[76] Hesiod, *Th.* 175.

[77] See Lagrange, p. 387 and Orelli, p. 28, n. 62.

[78] Gordon, *UT*, ʿnt: III: 35ff.

the thirty-second year of Kronos' reign, that is until thirty-two years after this defeat (811: 13-19). This is unlike the Greek myths in which Ouranos is castrated and never attempts to regain his position, virtually disappearing from the scene.[79]

810: 10-12 ἑάλω-γάμον

Kronos as victor distributes the spoils, particularly the women;[80] Dagon gets Ouranos' pregnant concubine. Clemen has seen further significance in these lines: when Kronos distributes Ouranos' wives, according to Clemen, it indicates his title to the kingship, much as in the Bible, Solomon controls the fortunes of Abishag. When a former royal concubine is given to Dagon this distinguishes him from the other gods.[81]

810: 12-13 τίκτει-Δημαροῦν

Demarous is Ouranos' child, born after his mother was given to Dagon. Demarous is mentioned several times in the extant fragments. He is the father of Melqart (811: 10), he fights Pontos and loses (811: 11-13), and he together with Astarte and Hadad rule the land with the consent of Kronos (811: 24-25). Demarous, as Ewald already saw, must be connected somehow with the Phoenician river mentioned by Strabo as the *Tamyras*, and by Polybius as the *Damouras*.[82] This river is between Sidon and Beirut; its appearance in this part of the fragments is an exception to the usual Byblian setting.[83]

The central point of debate about Demarous has been whether he is to be identified with Baal, whether his name is really an epithet of Baal. Among scholars who have argued for this identification, Lokkegaard sees Demarous as a transliteration of *ḏu maruṣ* which, he thinks, means the "weakened one," a proper epithet of Baal because that is what his other title (*zbl*) means.[84] That Demarous is a transliteration of *ḏu marus* is doubtful, but that either *ḏu maruṣ* or *zbl* means the "weakened one" is preposterous.[85] More cogent reasons for identifying Demarous and Baal were proposed by Cassuto,[86] who pointed to a difficult passage in the Ugaritic epics in which *dmrn* is in parallelism to Hadad.[87] Ugaritic *dmrn* thus may have been a poetic variant for Baal, one of Baal's epithets. Philo's Demarous appears once in the fragments in the dative, as Δημαροῦντι (811: 10), so that all four consonants of the Ugaritic name appear in Philo. Cassuto also noted that Philo's Demarous fights and loses to Pontos, much as Baal of the epics fights and loses (at first) to Yam.[88] In addition, Cassuto revived the emendation first proposed by Gruppe[89] in 811: 24-25. That text reads that Hadad and Zeus Demarous ruled the land: Ζεὺς Δημαροῦς καὶ Ἄδωδος. Cassuto suggested ὁ καὶ Ἄδωδος, thus equating Demarous and Hadad or Baal.[90] Finally, he argued that Baal in the Ugaritic epics is sometimes described as the son of El, at other times as the son of Dagon,[91] while Demarous in Philo can also be described as the son of two, if not three gods. Ouranos is his real father, but Kronos = El has authority over him and gives him to Dagon, his step-father.

---

[79] See p. 191. See also Mras, "Sanchuniathon," p. 185.

[80] Cf. Jud. 5: 30.

[81] See Clemen, pp. 63-64, based on II Sam. 16: 21ff. and I Kings 2: 17ff.

[82] Ewald, p. 24. Strabo 16,2,22; Polybius 5,68,9.

[83] Putting non-Byblian material into a Byblian setting can lead to confusion. This may help explain and alleviate the difficulty noticed by Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Zeus Demarous," pp. 553-555, who is puzzled by Demarous = Baal (see below) as father of Melqart (811: 10-11). Another possible explanation of the difficulty noticed by Du Mesnil du Buisson would rest on the fact reported by Cicero, *De Natura Deorum* 3,16,42 that Jupiter (i.e. Baalshamem) was the father of Tyrian Herakles (i.e. Melqart). Since Zeus Demarous was Baal, god of wind and rain, as was Baalshamem at Tyre, Philo may have associated the two gods with similar functions.

Cassuto concerned himself solely with the Ugaritic evidence and did not mention the river *Tamyras* or *Damouras*, yet Cassuto's *dmrn* could easily have been the name given to that river, thus tying together all the evidence presented. Baal or *dmrn* is the god of the heavenly waters, but as one Ugaritic passage indicates he also controls the waters below. When Danel curses the land, he prays that Baal should fail for seven years. There is to be no *ṭl*, no *rbb*, no *šrʿ thmtm*, and no *ṭbn ql bʿl.*[92] The third of these terms means "welling up of the deep,"[93] and clearly refers to the waters from below.

---

[84] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 66. For *zbl* as Baal's title see Gordon, *UT*, #815, p. 395.

[85] See especially Held, "*Zbl/sbl*," pp. 90-92.

[86] Cassuto, "Zeus Demarous," pp. 65-67.

[87] Gordon, *UT*, 51: VII: 38-39. The passage reads as follows *ib hd-lm thś//lm tḫś nṯq dmrn*. By elimination *hd-* (to be completed as *hdd* or Hadad), must be in parallelism to *dmrn*.

[88] Gordon, *UT*, 137: 36-37. See also Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 73; Dussaud, "Theogonie," pp. 227-228; Oldenburg, *Conflict*, pp. 139-141.

[89] Gruppe, pp. 356-360.

[90] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 66, n. 1 suggests that the emendation may be unnecessary, because *kai* may equal *ho kai* in Philo's usage. Cf. Blass & Debrunner *Grammar of the NT*, #268,1, p. 140. Lokkegaard is also incorrect about Philo's usage. See 808: 8; 809: 22; 811: 10; 812: 12 where Philo uses *ho kai*.

[91] See Kapelrud, *Baal*, pp. 64-65.

The evidence presented by Cassuto is convincing and I accept his identification. But there is one difficulty which should be noted. In Ugaritic the letter *d* is used to stand for two letters, *d* and *ḏ*;[94] *dmrn* can thus also be *ḏmrn*. Cassuto, in order to make the epithet *dmrn* comprehensible for Baal, suggests that it should be understood as the latter. As such, it would mean the strong or mighty one,[95] and would be the equivalent of Baal's other epithet *aliyn*;[96] but it would have entered Hebrew and Phoenician as זמרן,[97] and in Greek transliteration this name would be *Zemarous* and not Demarous.[98] This difficulty is not sufficient to overturn Cassuto's case; *dmrn* may yet be found perfectly comprehensible as an epithet for Baal and there will be no need to assume that it was *ḏmrn*.

810: 13-14 ἐπὶ τούτοις-Βύβλον

The primacy of Byblos, first suggested in 809: 15, is here re-asserted. Contrast the primacy of Tyre in 807: 19-809: 13. It seems likely that the two contradictory mythologies come from temples of these two cities.

810: 14-16 μετὰ ταῦτα-κατέχωσε

Philo merely tells us that Kronos suspected Atlas and therefore banished him, without saying what Atlas had done to merit this punishment. He may have been suspected of rebellion, perhaps of plotting to depose Kronos = El and to sit on the throne. Euhemerus tells a similar story involving Saturn and Ops.[99] Philo's account of the punishment of Atlas may thus be another of the commonplaces of Euhemeristic historiography.

---

[92] Gordon, *UT*, 1 Aqht: 45.

[93] Ginsberg in *ANET*, p. 153. See also *ibid.*, n. 34.

[94] Gordon, *UT*, 5.3, pp. 26-27.

[95] Cassuto, "Zeus Demarous," p. 66. See also Gordon, *UT*, #727, p. 388.

[96] *Ibid.*, #1342, p. 426.

[97] The Ugaritic *ḏ* becomes a ז in Hebrew and Phoenician, Gordon, *UT*, 5.13, p. 30.

[98] This is the normal pattern of transliteration of Hebrew names in the Septuagint See e.g. Gen. 30: 20 LXX.

From the Phoenician vantage point, Du Mesnil du Buisson has plausibly compared Philo's account with the story of הלל בן שחר in Isa. 14: 12ff.[100] The story in Isaiah has been recognized as an echo of some ancient myth.[101] הלל plotted to "scale the sky," and set his throne "above El's stars." He hoped to "match Elyon" and to "sit in the assembled gathering in heaven." Instead he was punished, "brought down to Sheol, to the lowest pit."[102] This punishment would explain Philo's equation of הלל with Atlas, who is located by Hesiod just outside the gates of Tartaros.[103] We may therefore accept Du Mesnil du Buisson's suggestion.

810: 16-18 κατὰ τοῦτον-ἀφιέρωσαν

According to 809: 11-12 the Dioskouroi invented a boat.[104] Philo now tells us what happened on one (the first?) voyage. The Mt. Kassios on which they were cast ashore can be either that on the Syrian coast or that in Egypt. Philo does not specify which one.[105]

810: 18-19 οἱ δε-Κρόνου

Ἤλου τοῦ Κρόνου would ordinarily mean, "of El, son of Kronos." But El and Kronos have been identified (809: 22). Therefore no commentator on the fragments or translator of Eusebius, to my knowledge, has rendered "El, son of Kronos." Instead all have translated the phrase as if Philo had written τοῦ καὶ Κρόνου, or as if τοῦ Κρόνου were in parentheses or set off by commas, thus maintaining the equivalence of El and Kronos. It is probably easiest to set τοῦ Κρόνου between commas, as was done by Bunsen.[106]

---

[99] *FGrH* 63 F 14.

[100] Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Le Groupe," pp. 44-49.

[101] Ginsberg, "Reflexes of Sargon," p. 51, n. 23. The actors and contents of this myth in its native version(s) remain subjects of speculation. Compare Teixidor, "BES 1971," #101, pp. 473-474, and Clapham, pp. 151-152.

[102] These quotations and translations are Ginsberg's, *ibid.*, p. 51.

[103] Hesiod, *Th.* 746 and West's note to it.

[104] See Chapter Seven, p. 176.

[105] Cf. Eissfeldt, "Tabor," p. 32.

The meaning of the phrases as a whole was most clearly seen by Lagrange. Philo, according to Lagrange, assumes that his readers are familiar with the term for gods in Phoenician אלנם,[107] or אלהן in Aramaic.[108] As a good Euhemerist, Philo would like to show that this term was originally applied to mortals. He is accordingly telling his reader, do not think that אלנם or אלהן are groups of gods. The word was originally applied to the "human" allies of the "mortal" El,[109] as they would have been called Κρόνιοι had the nickname been based on Kronos.

This interpretation is confirmed by a comparison of Philo with Euhemerus and Dionysios Skytobrachion. Indeed, as was argued above, we again see Philo conforming to the canons of Euhemeristic historiography. Both Euhemerus and D. Skytobrachion want to assert the mortal nature of the Titans of Greek myth. Euhemerus speaks of two mortal rivals, Titan and Saturn, and claims that the Titans were nothing more than mortal children of the mortal Titan.[110] D. Skytobrachion discusses the mortal couple Ouranos and Titaios. Ouranos had eighteen children by Titaios; the children were called Titans after their mother.[111]

810: 19-23 Κρόνος-γνώμην

Kronos *murdered* or *executed* two of his children—the boy Sadid and an unnamed girl—because he suspected them, probably of plotting against him. This story is apparently different from the stories of Kronos' *sacrifices* of his children narrated in 812: 6-7 and 813: 26-814: 17. Therefore the attempts of Bunsen and Eissfeldt to equate Sadid of our passage with Yeoud (the boy sacrificed in 814: 13) and to read Yeoud in our passage are not justified.[112]

---

[106] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 831.

[107] See the passages cited in KAI, Vol. 3, p. 2. See also Miller, "El," p. 416.

[108] KAI, Vol. 3, p. 28.

[109] Lagrange, p. 389. Cf. Torrey, "God of Sarepta," pp. 45-49.

[110] *FGrH* 63 F 14-15.

[111] *FGrH* 32 F 7, 57, 1. For a similar explanation of the Atlantides see F 7, 60,4.

[112] Bunsen, Vol. 4, p. 247; Eissfeldt, *S. von B.*, p. 19. Cf. Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 74; Barr. "Philo of Byblos," p. 27, n. 3.

Loewenstamm has noted a significant contrast between Philo's account of El = Kronos, and El of the Ugaritic epics. Philo's El = Kronos is cruel and harsh, as can clearly be seen from this passage. El of Ugarit, by contrast, is a benevolent god.[113] We therefore have another clue to the nature of the relationship between Philo's account of El = Kronos and the other succession myths.

810: 23-26 χρόνου-ἐποιήσατο

The three wives Kronos acquires in this passage are the same wives whose children by Kronos are discussed in 810: 29-811: 4. The text specifies that Ouranos was the common father of Kronos and these wives, but it does not specify that Ge was their common mother. The marriages are nonetheless sufficiently incestuous to call for comment, which is odd since mythology was notoriously outside the bounds of everyday morality[114] (thus the incest of Ouranos and Ge was passed over in silence). Perhaps the incest in this case was of some political or liturgical importance.

Each of the wives here assigned to Kronos poses a problem of a different sort. Astarte, the first, is here identified by Phoenician name only, but in 812: 3 she is equated with Greek Aphrodite. In Phoenician terms, Astarte might have been the consort of El in the pantheon of some city, but that city cannot be identified. We do know that the city cannot have been Ugarit where El's consort was Lady Asherah of the Sea.[115] In Greek terms the coupling of Kronos and Aphrodite is unusual; the male gods usually associated with her are Ares and Hephaistos.[116]

Philo does not identify Rhea with a Phoenician goddess and no equations have been proposed by scholars who have studied the fragments. In Greek terms, however, her presence as Kronos' consort makes sense.[117]

---

[113] On El's benevolence in Ugarit see Pope, *El*, p. 44. Pope also noted the contrast between Ugarit and Philo. Loewenstamm, "Philon," pp. 320-321.

[114] The Greek reaction against the "immorality" of mythology can already be seen in Xenophanes DK B 11-12.

[115] See Pope, *El*, pp. 36-37.

[116] I have found no trace of the couple Kronos and Aphrodite.

[117] Rose, *Handbook*, p. 21.

In 812: 12-13 Dione is identified as Baaltis of Byblos, that is as the "Lady of Byblos," בעלת גבל known from inscriptions.[118] The god El, as we shall see, was also known at Byblos, but there is no certain evidence, to confirm Philo, that the Byblians believed El and the Lady of Byblos were consorts. When בעלת גבל is mentioned in Byblian inscriptions she is usually alone.[119] She must be introduced by emendation in KAI 4,[120] but if the emendation is correct she is there mentioned together with the מפחרת אל גבל קדשם "assembly of the holy gods of Byblos," and Baalshamem.[121] In spite of this difficulty Philo is probably correct in coupling Baalat Gebal and El. The consort of Baalat Gebal must be the Baal Gebal, who in Philo's myth is certainly El.[122] There are therefore some difficulties in all three of the couples. Some Phoenicians or Greeks may have made Kronos = El the husband of each of these goddesses, but we lack evidence to prove this beyond doubt.

810: 26-28 γνοὺς-κατέσχεν

The mission of Astarte, Rhea and Dione having failed, Ouranos sends Heimarmene, Hora and others against Kronos. This mission fails as its members desert Ouranos for Kronos. Scholars have properly hesitated to propose Phoenician equivalents for Heimarmene and Hora. Lokkegaard has suggested that Heimarmene may be the equivalent of Hebrew גד,[123] which in turn may exist in Ugaritic.[124] She would be a goddess of harmony and thus properly equated with Heimarmene.[125] This interpretation, as Lokkegaard admits, is possible at best and it seems best to concede that we do not know the significance of these lines.

810: 28-29 ἔτι δὲ-μηχανησάμενος

---

[118] KAI 5,6 etc.

[119] KAI 5,6,7, and 10.

[120] The text reads בעל, but the emendation to בעלת is virtually certain.

[121] KAI 4, lines 3-4.

[122] Moscati, *Phoenicians*, pp. 31-32. The couple of Kronos and Dione is unusual in Greek terms as Dione is normally associated with Zeus. Rose, *Handbook*, p. 53.

[123] See BDB s.v. גד II, p. 151.

[124] Gordon, *UT*, 121: 4.

[125] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 67. On גד in the Phoenician world see Teixidor, "BES 1967," #29, p. 169. See also Benz, *Personal Names*, pp. 294-295.

Ouranos' two attempts on Kronos have failed. Lokkegaard has the merit of recognizing that the invention of betyls is a third attempt. The betyls, or animated stones, were described by Damascius as having the property of independent movement.[126] As such they could attack Kronos or ward him off from afar.[127] Philo's Euhemerism is again apparent. He knows that betyls are worshipped by Phoenicians as divine (see below) and therefore stresses the origin of the betyls, their invention by the "mortal" Ouranos for his wars.

The best evidence for the worship of betyls by the Phoenicians is that of the coins. A very popular Sidonian coin type, first minted at the time of Augustus, shows the betyl in its car.[128] A Byblian coin type shows a temple with a conical betyl exposed.[129] Tyrian coins present the two "ambrosial rocks," which may also be betyls.[130] The betyls must have commanded the devotion and loyality of the people to appear on the coins so frequently.

The cult of betyls, as Bochart already recognized must be connected with the events narrated in Gen. chapter 28.[131] In v. 22 Jacob says that the stone on which he slept and which he has annointed (28:18) shall be a בית אלהים, a house of God. Presumably Jacob recognizes that this stone is connected with the visions, and he therefore supposes the stone is a house of god. Betyls, with their supposed property of independent movement, must have required an explanation, and they too must have been understood as abodes of gods, each one a בית אל.[132]

In addition to the betyls of this passage, Philo also speaks of a god called Baitylos in 809: 23. The worship by the Phoenicians of a god by this name is confirmed by the treaty between Baalu of Tyre and Esarhaddon. *Ba-a-a-ti-ilani*, or Baitylos, is one of the divine guarantors of the treaty.[133] The god's name also appears compounded in several personal names,[134] and may also be intended in Jer. 48:13.[135] The god was worshipped by the Jewish community at Elephantine,[136] and is mentioned, as Zeus Betylos, in an inscription of the Roman period from Doura.[137]

---

[126] Damascius, *Vita Isidori Fragmenta* (Ed. Zintzen), Frag. 203.

[127] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 68.

[128] See Hill, *BMC Phoenicia*, Sidon #207 and many others.

[129] *Ibid.*, Byblos, #37.

[130] *Ibid.*, Tyre, #429. See Chapter Seven, p. 165.

[131] Bochart, p. 708. The connection Bochart saw between Philo and Gen. 28 is different than the one made today.

[132] To my knowledge, only Zuntz, "Baitylos and Bethel," pp. 178-179 has doubted this interpretation.

Philo, it would seem, has two separate entities—the stone betyls and the "mortal" Baitylos. The existence of each is confirmed by external evidence. The names of the two are so similar there should be some connection between them, yet Philo does not explain their relationship. Nor does the other evidence about the stones or the god answer this question unequivocally, and the subject remains obscure. Scholars have disagreed widely as to which people or peoples were particularly devoted to Baitylos, who spread his worship, and what were his functions.[138]

810: 29-811: 2 Κρόνῳ-ἀφιερώθη

This passage is the beginning of a genealogical section in which the fragments are even briefer and more enigmatic than usual. Kronos and Astarte are the parents of the seven Titanids or Artemids. Lagrange was disturbed by the apparent mention of two Greek names rather than the usual pattern of one Phoenician and one equivalent Greek name. He therefore suggested that Titanids was an error for *Tanitides*, seven Tanits or goddesses of Carthage.[139] Cooke was attracted by Lagrange's suggestion but reluctant to adopt it, probably because there is no evidence of seven Tanits.[140]

---

[133] Baalu treaty, lines 6-7, *ANET Supplement*, p. 98. Cf. Teixidor, *The Pagan God*, p. 31.

[134] For a selection of these names see Eissfeldt, "Bethel," p. 21.

[135] Milik, "Cultes," p. 565 argues that this verse does not necessarily prove that there was a god Bethel. The parallelism, according to Milik, need not suggest that Bethel is a god as Chemosh is a god. Rather, Milik argues, the verse means that as the Moabites were embarrassed because of their unjustified faith in Chemosh, so the Israelites will be embarrassed of their unjustified faith in Bethel—the place and the sanctuary.

[136] The compound deities of Elephantine are discussed by Milik, "Cultes," pp. 565-577.

[137] Baur & Rostovtzeff, *Excavations at Dura, Fourth Seasons*, pp. 68ff.

[138] Baitylos is so enigmatic that we cannot adequately utilize the one clue to his functions provided by the Baalu treaty. Baitylos will punish the treaty breaker by sending hungry lions against him. This punishment must somehow be related to Baitylos' functions. The relevance of this clue is confirmed by another source, IGLS 376, a dedication to *Seim*, *Symbetyl*, and the Lion. The middle god of this triad is obviously a compound of Baitylos; the latter is clearly associated with a lion. See Milik, "Cultes," pp. 604-605; Teixidor, "BES 1969," #102, p. 343. While some scholars have recognized the relevance of this clue, the problems posed by Baitylos and the many Baitylos compounds have not been fully resolved. For scholarly disagreement compare the analyses of Milik, "Cultes," pp. 565-577; Rofé, *Emunah Bemalachim*, pp. 219-234; Albright, *ARI*, pp. 162-168; Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Etudes*, pp. 121-128. See also Teixidor, *The Pagan God*, pp. 30-31.

Albright notes that Artemids, in Greek terms, could refer to birth goddesses, as that is one of Artemis' functions. The Ugaritic epic of Aqhat, Albright maintains, also has seven birth goddesses or Koscharot; Artemids, Titanids, and Koscharot are therefore to be identified.[141] Albright's suggestion is based on the Aqhat texts. If it had no other support but the Aqhat texts it would, however, be doubtful as the Aqhat epic never mentions *seven* Koscharot; they stay for seven days, but this does not prove they were seven.[142] The birth goddess function is also not clear in the Aqhat epic. They come at the time of conception and Danel begins to count the months of pregnancy after which they leave.[143] The delivery is never described in the extant tablets. Albright's suggestion is however confirmed by other Ugaritic sources (which Albright did not cite). In the Nikal text, the Koscharot are called at the time of childbirth.[144] Furthermore, the names of the Koscharot are apparently listed at the end of that text,[145] and there seem to be seven names. For the Titanids see below on 813: 1-2.

In addition to the seven girls Kronos had by Astarte he had seven boys by Rhea. The youngest of these boys died at birth and was consecrated (ἀφιερώθη) as divine. This interpretation of the passage is confirmed by several other passages in the fragments. Philo often uses ἀφιερόω in contexts where it must mean consecrate and not sacrifice,[146] such as in 809: 20 where the death of Elioun is mentioned.

---

[139] Lagrange, p. 388.

[140] Cooke, *Textbook*, p. 133, n. 2.

[141] Albright, *YGC*, p. 143 following a suggestion of Clemen, p. 72.

[142] Gordon, *UT*, 2 Aqht: II: 39.

[143] *Ibid.*, 2 Aqht: II: 43ff.

[144] Gordon, *UT*, 77: 5ff.

[145] Gordon, *UT*, 77: 45-50. In adopting this interpretation of *UT* 77, I am following a suggestion of Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Etudes*, p. 3.

[146] ἀφιερόω can mean sacrifice, as in *P.E.* 3,11,46.

Elioun, having died, ἀφιερώθη; clearly this must mean "he was consecrated." In addition Philo retells the story of the death of the boy in 812: 9-11.[147] The child of 812: 9-11 was also the son of Kronos and Rhea; his name was Mouth (מות) or death. Of him Philo writes, ἀποθάνοντα ἀφιεροῖ, which must mean, [Kronos] "consecrated him after his death."

811: 3-4 καὶ ἀπὸ-Ἔρως

The number and names of the children of Kronos and Dione have fallen out of the MSS., as Jacoby rightly saw. The two boys of Kronos and Astarte, Pothos and Eros, seem to have so puzzled commentators that they offered no comment. Perhaps the full text of the *Phoenician History* would have given a clearer indication of Philo's meaning. But as things are it looks as if these were the well-known children of the Greek Aphrodite.[148]

811: 4-5 ὁ δὲ Δαγὼν-Ἀρότριος

Dagon's invention of corn and the plow were discussed above, p. 190.

811: 5-6 Συδύκῳ-Ἀσκληπίον

More information about Sydyk and his children, including Asklepios, will be given in 813: 1-2. The entire subject will therefore be discussed in the commentary on those lines.

811: 6-7 ἐγεννήθησαν-Ἀπόλλων

Another group of Kronos' children, whose mother(s) are not named in the extant fragments, are those "born in Peraia." Peraia is difficult to place. Bunsen thought it might be in Transjordan or in Upper Mesopotamia.[149] He preferred the latter, on the basis of Stephanus of Byzantium's entry concerning Nisibis (in which some of the information is derived from Philo), and in which Nisibis is placed in "the peraia." (817: 5-9).[150] But this is uncertain; Stephanus also gives s.v. *Peraia*, πολίχνιον Συρίας, "a small town in Syria," "The peraia" is not a place name but a common noun (as is indicated by the article and the specifying noun which follow). If *peraia* in 811 : 6 were also a common noun it could mean on the "other side" of almost any river, strait, or the like. Many regions of the ancient world were presumably thus known locally.[151]

---

[147] The child consecrated in 812: 9-11 is called ἕτερον αὐτοῦ παῖδα, suggesting that this is not the same child whose death is discussed in our passage. But as we shall see in the commentary on 812: 9-11, ἕτερον distinguishes Mouth from the child sacrificed in 812: 6, and not from the child of our passage. Cf. Clemen, p. 73 & Du Mesnil du Buisson, "El," pp. 282-283.

[148] See Höfer, "Pothos," cols. 2903-4.

[149] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 833, n. 17.

Philo's *Peraia* could be identified on two conditions: (1) if Philo meant "god worshipped in *Peraia*" when he wrote of "mortals born in *Peraia*;" and (2) if these gods could be identified and the place where they were worshipped established. The first of these conditions is probably met thanks to Philo's Euhemerism. The second condition is much more difficult to meet.

"Kronos of the same name as his father" (Kronos jr.), has been so enigmatic that he has provoked few theories or comments.[152] Apollo is a bit clearer. A Cypriot inscription identifies רשפחץ and Apollo Amyklos.[153] Philo could thus have been thinking of Reseph when he wrote Apollo, but this does not solve the problem of locating Peraia.[154] A different clue is provided by Strabo who says that there was a sanctuary of Apollo at Borsippa, near Babylon.[155] This may be the Apollo Philo intended but there is no proof. By Philo's time there were cults of Apollo all over Syria.[156] Zeus Belos was identified by Williams, following Clemen, as Babylonian Bel.[157] But the deity's name, like names of the Greek gods, had long been given to many local Syrian deities, above all to one of the major gods of Palmyra.[158]

---

[150] Cf. Clemen, p. 74.

[151] One of the more famous was the Southeast corner of Asia Minor which was known as the "peraia" of Rhodes. See also Josephus *BJ* 3, 44-47.

[152] See Clapham, p. 126.

[153] KAI 39, line 3. On Resheph see Teixidor "BES 1969," #85 & 86, pp. 337-339; "BES 1970," #68 & 69, pp. 369-370; "BES 1972," #45, pp. 418-419.

[154] On Resheph see Albright, *YGC*, pp. 139-140. See also Fulco, *The Canaanite God Resep.*

[155] Strabo 16,1,7. See also Lagrange, p. 388.

[156] Beirut: *Hill, BMC Phoenicia*, p. liv; Sidon, *ibid.*, p. cxiii; Tyre, *ibid.*, p. cxxxiii.

[157] Williams, p. 177; Clemen, p. 74.

[158] Seyrig, "AS 93," pp. 85ff. See also "AS 30," p. 302.

To conclude, there is not enough information about the gods to locate Peraia beyond doubt. Philo's territorial references are, however, usually close to home. Of all the possibilities the best identification would therefore be the Syrian townlet mentioned by Stephanus.

811: 7-8 κατά-παῖς

Of the three "mortals" introduced in these sentences as contemporaries of Kronos' Peraian children, Pontos and Typhon seem to form a pair while Nereus is introduced as father of Pontos and son of Belos (presumably Zeus Belos). Nereus—or at least the phrase describing him—thus seems an addition. Further it creates a difficulty, since it represents at least Pontos as a grandson of Zeus Belos, with whom he was presented as contemporary. If original it probably indicates sloppy excerpting, either by Eusebius (of Philo) or by Philo (of his sources).

Pontos and Nereus form a pair in Greek mythology and should therefore be considered together. The Greeks made Pontos the father of Nereus,[159] while Philo has Nereus as father of Pontos. Due to his name, Pontos is an obvious candidate for equation with Ugaritic Yam, an equation proposed by Eissfeldt.[160] Yet there is another character in the fragments who might also have been equated with Yam, Poseidon of 811: 10. Lokkegaard reserved Yam for Poseidon and therefore tried to discover some other equation for Pontos. (This was unnecessary; a single Semitic deity might, in different places, be identified with different Greek gods and vice versa.) Lokkegaard hesitantly suggested that Pontos and Nereus might be Ugaritic Madid and Nahar.[161] I cannot find a *mdd* in Ugaritic with the proper sense, but perhaps Lokkegaard intended *mdb* which exists in Ugaritic and has the required meaning, "flood or ocean."[162] This meaning, however, is inferred from one passage in which *mdb*//*ym*.[163] *Mdb* may therefore not be idependent, and may differ from *Ym* no more than Aliyn from Baal. Similarly Nahar in Ugaritic is not independent but "an alternative name of the god Yam."[164] How far the multiplicity of names indicates cultic or conceptual differences—either in native Greek culture, or in Ugaritic, or in the amalgam of Philo's own time it is almost impossible to tell. At most we may recognize that Philo's profusion of names for sea deities is matched by that of Ugaritic poetry, but may be explained by a conflation of several local traditions. Poseidon, for example, is explicitly identified as the god of Beirut (812: 13) while in this section we seem to have the pantheon of Byblos. Ugaritic Yam can therefore be identified with Pontos, and Demarous' conflict with Pontos can reflect that of Baal with Yam.[165]

---

[159] See e.g. Rose, *Handbook*, p. 25.

[160] Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, pp. 27-28.

[161] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 73.

[162] *mdd* in Ugaritic means to measure; See Gordon, *UT*, #1427, pp. 430-431. Perhaps *mdd* in Lokkegaard's article is therefore a typographical error for *mdb*, Gordon, *UT*, #1425, p. 430, which has the proper sense.

[163] Gordon, *UT*, 52: 34.

Lokkegaard is more sucessful with Typho. Typho of Greek mythology is some sort of terrible dragon, perhaps a sea monster, of oriental origin.[166] Ugarit has taught us of the famous monster enemies of Baal, the *tnn* and the *bṯn ʿqltn*.[167] The proper name of the latter monster is *ltn*.[168] West and Williams both see the Near Eastern parallels to Greek Typho in Hittite and Hurrian myth,[169] but Lokkegaard points to the Ugaritic material and opens the possibility of seeing Philo's and Greek Typho as a metamorphosis of the Ugaritic monsters.[170]

The issue, however, is quite complex. The origins of the Greek Typho myths are not beyond doubt.[171] Furthermore, any comparison between Greek Typho and the Ugaritic monsters depends on the interpretation of several obscure passages of the Ugaritic epics.[172] In these passages, it is not clear who killed Lotan, Baal or Anat.[173]

---

[164] *Ibid.*, #1623, p. 442.

[165] See above, pp. 195-197. Cf. Clapham pp. 148-149.

[166] See e.g., Williams, pp. 9-26. For Typho as a sea monster, see Williams, p. 17.

[167] Gordon, *UT*, ʿnt: III: 37-38.

[168] *Ibid.*, 67: I: 1. See also Ginsberg ap. *ANET*, p. 139, n. 10. For the now obvious connection of these monsters with Isa. 27: 1 see Cassuto, *Anat*, pp. 39-40.

[169] Williams, pp. 23-25; West, *Theogony*, pp. 18-21.

[170] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 73.

[171] See Vian, "Mythe de Typhée," pp. 27-28.

[172] See above, notes 167-168.

[173] See Loewenstamm, "Myth of the Sea," p. 98. Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, pp. 113 & 150 argues that Baal alone killed Lotan. Oldenburg, *Conflict*, pp. 32-33, 71, 137-141 suggests that Anat killed Lotan, but for Baal. Held, "Mḫṣ/mḫš," p. 172, n. 57 argues

If the former, the parallel between the Greek and Ugaritic accounts is valid. If the latter, then one must face the difficulty that Zeus fights Typho, while Anat fights the Ugaritic monsters.

811: 9-10 ἀπὸ δὲ-Ποσειδῶν

Sidon is almost certainly the eponymous goddess of the city. As such her descent from Pontos would be comprehensible.[174] Why she discovered unaccompanied hymns[175] is unclear; perhaps the city was once famous for its singers or choirs.[176]

Poseidon is for Philo the chief native[177] god of Beirut (812: 13), and here Philo certainly reflects the local mythology of his time; the god is represented on numerous Beirutian coins.[178] The gods of both Sidon and Beirut thus appear in this Byblian section of the fragments. Their relative insignificance may not be accidental.

811: 10-11 τῷ δὲ-Ἡρακλῆς

Philo makes the usual identification, attested (if not invented) by Herodotus, of Melqart and Greek Herakles.[179] Herodotus and Phoenician sources also establish the importance of Melqart for the Tyrians.[180] The meaning of Melqart's name was one of the earliest facts in the fragments to be established: Bochart already realized that Melqart was מלכקרת, "King of the City."[181] Melqart is therefore a title and not the god's proper name.

An important passage in Menander (*FGrH* 783 F 1) cited by Josephus speaks of the Tyrian festival of the awakening of Herakles

---

for Anat as victor. For an earlier version of this debate see Ginsberg, "Anath," pp. 12-14 and Albright, "Anath and the Dragon," pp. 14-17.

[174] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 73.

[175] See Du Cange, *Glossarium*, s.v. ᾠδή.

[176] See Williams, p. 177. Traces of the musical fame of Sidon are virtually impossible to find. Juvenal, *Sat.* 3, 62-65 speaks of the fame of Syria as a whole, while Theopompus *FGrH* 115 F 114 speaks of the dissolute life of the Sidonian court, including singing and dancing girls.

[177] See Clapham, p. 147.

[178] See Hill, *BMC Phoenicia*, Berytus, #1-5 and many others.

[179] Hdt. 2, 44. See also KAI 47, a bilingual inscription to Melqart (in Phoenician) and Herakles (in Greek).

[180] See KAI 47.

[181] Bochart, p. 709.

(= Melqart). An inscription of the Greco-Roman period mentions someone who held the office of "awakener" (ἐγερσείτην) of Herakles.[182] These texts, as Baudissin realized, indicate that Melqart must have been some sort of dying and reviving god.[183] Another line of argument, developed by Albright, shows that Melqart was a god of the Resheph or Nergal type, that is when he is called "King of the City," the title means "King of the *Underworld* City."[184] Albright summarizes both these aspects of the god by concluding that as god of the underworld Melqart was "at the same time a chthonic deity, that is, he was lord of the ground and of its productive faculties."[185] This interpretation is beautifully confirmed by a text Albright never cites—the Baalu treaty. Melqart is there mentioned together with Eshmun. They will punish the treaty breaker by destroying his land, enslaving his people, and depriving him of food, clothing and oil.[186] The curses assigned to a god are obvious clues to his functions, and the curses in the Baalu treaty fit the functions Albright has attributed to Melqart. Melqart thus emerges as a god who controls prosperity through his role as a chthonic deity, a normal part of the functions of chthonic gods.[187]

As should be obvious, I totally disagree with those scholars who understand Melqart as a weather god of the Hadad type.[188] Melqart is called the Baal of Tyre in KAI 47, but the Baalu treaty clearly indicates the sense of the title in the inscription: Melqart cannot be the Baal = Hadad of Tyre. Rather he is the Baal = Lord = Chief god of Tyre.[189]

---

[182] Abel, "Inscriptions de Transjordanie," pp. 577-578.

[183] Baudissin, *Adonis*, p. 172; See Smith, "Aretalogies," p. 185 and n. 79 for later discussions; Teixidor, "BES 1969," #13, pp. 320-321.

[184] Albright, *YGC*, p. 128. Albright, "Hauron," pp. 10-12. Seyrig, "AS 39," pp. 69-74, reached the same conclusion from a different perspective, that of the monuments. See also Weinfeld "Molech & the Queen of Heaven." pp. 136-137.

[185] Albright, *ARI*, p. 79. Cf. Dussaud, "Melqart," pp. 205-230. and KAI Vol. 2, p. 53.

[186] Baalu treaty, lines 14-18, *ANET Suppl.*, p. 98.

[187] See e.g. Guthrie, *Greeks and their Gods*, p. 218.

[188] See Oldenburg, *Conflict*, p. 82, n. 2. Du Mesnil du Buisson, *NE*, p. 62.

[189] Teixidor, "BES 1975," #127, pp. 283-284. Teixidor's remarks on the consequences of this interpretation of Melqart for the understanding of the contest between the Baal prophets and Elijah (1 Kings 16: 29-19: 21) are particularly important.

Melqart as Baal = Lord = Chief deity of Tyre, although generally accepted by

811: 11-13 εἶτα πάλιν-ηὔξατο

This passage may reflect the wars of Baal and Yam of Ugaritic myth, as was argued above, p. 196.[190]

Schwabl has interpreted this passage differently. He notes that Okeanos and his family fight for Zeus against the Titans in Hesiod (*Th.* 283ff., 398). Similarily in Philo, Pontos fights for El-Kronos against Demarous. This battle thus testifies to a later war between El = Kronos and Demarous.[191]

Several objections should be noted. First, there is not a word in Philo suggesting that Pontos was fighting against Demarous on behalf of El = Kronos. Next, Hesiod's Okeanos who fights *for* Zeus cannot simply be compared with someone who fights *against* Zeus Demarous (811: 24). Finally, the whole notion of a conflict between Zeus Demarous and El = Kronos is foreign to Philo. See 811: 24ff and the commentary *ad loc.*

811: 13-19 ἔτει δὲ-χωρίον

After thirty-two years of warfare Ouranos is finally killed by Kronos. Philo's account resembles Hesiod in important points. Ouranos is castrated in both versions and while some details differ, Philo, in describing the castration, has used a key word with important Hesiodic associations: λοχήσας (811: 15; cf. Hesiod, *Th.* 174 & 178). This is another clue to the nature of Philo's sources and validity of his theories to be discussed in the following chapter. Both authors tell of the special properties of the blood of Ouranos' genitals; Hesiod speaks of the birth of Aphrodite,[192] while Philo describes the red waters of the rivers into which the blood dripped, a place which seems to have been a tourist site.

The site is famous as the place where Ouranos died. Perhaps it was also famous because the waters still become red periodically. I find this interpretation attractive because the scene of action in this section

---

scholars, is not beyond doubt. See Teixidor, "BES 1974," #49, p. 307. On Melqart's family in Philo and other sources see above, p. 195, n. 83. See also Seyrig, "AS 83," pp. 19-20.

[190] See also Albright, *YGC*, p. 133.

[191] Schwabl, "Griech. Theog.," pp. 47-48.

[192] Hesiod. *Th.*, 190ff.

of the fragments is twice specified as Byblos (809: 15 and 810: 13) and Philo is certainly retelling Byblian myths here; Byblos had a famous river nearby—Nahr Ibrahim—which ran red at certain times of the year.[193] The emphasis on the dripping blood into the rivers is an allusion to the famous red waters of Nahr Ibrahim. For Philo the castration of Ouranos must be the myth which explains the redness of the river: given the special nature of the blood which dripped into the waters they become red periodically.[194]

811: 20-23 τοσαῦτα-ευδαιμονίας

These lines have been assigned sometimes to Philo, sometimes to Eusebius, but are obviously by the latter, being a sneer at pagan mythology, so Bunsen, Clemen, and Mras.[195]

Two minor points remain. The words πρῶτον χρύσεόν τε γένος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων, "the first and golden race of articulate men," are an echo from Hesiod.[196] I have taken the next phrase, τῆς μακαριζομένης ἐκείνης τῶν παλαιῶν εὐδαιμονίας, as a genitive of exclamation, as suggested by Mras.[197]

iv

Philo's account of Kronos, as he would have us read it, is of the life of a mortal. The original version, as we have seen, was a myth, like Hesiod's myths of Kronos, a cosmogony by succession.[198] Philo's account is also based on Byblian mythology as opposed to the Tyrian myths discussed in the previous chapter. We have then in the fragments three parallel cosmogonies: one of unknown provenance, one of Tyre and one a cosmogony by succession from Byblos. The Byblian myth went on to tell in detail of the wars of Kronos, wars similar to those of Hesiod's Kronos. Throughout the commentary on these fragments, aspects of Philo's story have been noted as disturbing from either a Ugaritic, Phoenician or Greek point of view. These aspects should provide good clues for evaluating the claims and theories Philo proposes, and for analyzing the relationship between Philo's story and Hesiod's.

---

[193] Clemen, *Lukian's Schrift*, p. 34; Eissfeldt, *RS*, p. 125, Mras, "Sanchuniathon," p. 185.

[194] Lucian, while visiting Byblos, learned a different Byblian myth explaining the red waters: they become red from the blood of the wounded Adonis, *Syr. D.* 8. Lucian's story must be that of a different temple than the one from which Philo's was derived. Lipinski, "El's Abode," p. 14 recognized that different explanations, deriving from different temples were in circulation. Cf. Baudissin, *Adonis*, p. 125; Du Mesnil du Buisson, *NE*, p. 2.

[195] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 835; Clemen, p. 29; Mras, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, Vol. 1, p. 49. Cf. Williams, p. 108. These lines are very similar to Eusebius' summary and comment which follow the cosmogony.

[196] Hesiod, *Op.*, 109.

[197] See the critical apparatus in Mras *ad loc.*

[198] See K & R, pp. 34-37. Cf. above Chapter Eight, p. 180, n. 1.

CHAPTER NINE

KRONOS' VICTORY & PHILO'S CONCLUSION

i

Kronos and his party have won the war against Ouranos. As victors they divide the spoils, rule of various parts of the world. As narrated by Philo, the "mortal" Kronos will assign countries to his "mortal" allies. These passages, as Eissfeldt first realized,[1] are very similar to Deut. 32: 8-9 which, as it now stands, tells how Elioun divided up the nations according to the number of the "Children of Israel," בני ישראל. The Septuagint renders the latter phrase ἀγγέλων θεοῦ, suggesting that its Hebrew text read בני אל or בני האלים.[2] This reading has been confirmed by a text from Qumran which reads בני אל.[3] The entire verse would therefore be: בהנחל עליון גוים בהפרידו בני אדם יצב גבולות עמים למספר בני אל. This makes much better sense than the version of the Massoretic text: the verses explain how when Elioun (= YHWH?) divided up the nations he assigned a god to each and YHWH received Israel.[4]

A second set of passages to be considered in this chapter contain Philo's theory explaining the similarities between his stories and those of the Greek poets. Philo believes that he has presented the original version of the stories, a version later brought to Greece, embellished and expanded. Philo argues that the readers of his time have become so accustomed to these later incorrect expansions of the original that they no longer accept the true account. In commenting on these passages I hope to evaluate Philo's theory, and attempt to discover and demonstrate the true relationship between Philo's material and the Greek stories.

---

[1] Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, p. 45, n. 1.

[2] ἄγγελοι in the LXX can render Hebrew בני האלהים, e.g. Gen. 6: 2(A); Job 1: 6; Job 38: 7.

[3] See Skehan, "Song of Moses, Qumran," p. 12.

[4] I follow the excellent discussion of Rofe, *Emunah Bemalachim*, pp. 66-69. Cf. Hesiod, *Th.* 885 where Zeus distributes honors after his victory. On the identity of *Elioun* in Deut. 32: 8 see below n. 9.

ii

Translation of Texts Discussed

(Eusebius)

(811: 23) And again the author, after other [things], adds to these [stories], saying:

(Philo)

(811: 24) Astarte the Greatest, and Zeus Demarous or[5] Adad King of the Gods ruled the country with Kronos' consent. Astarte placed upon her own head, as a mark of royalty, the head of a bull. (812: 1) And, wandering the world, she found a star fallen from the air, which she picked up and consecrated in the holy island of Tyre. (812: 3) Astarte, the Phoenicians say, is Aphrodite. (812: 4) And Kronos too, going about the world, gives to Athena, his daughter, the dominion over Attica. (812: 6) But when there was pestilence and death Kronos gives his beloved[6] son to Ouranos, his father, as a wholly burned offering. He also circumcizes his [own] genitals and forced the allies with him to do the same. (812: 9) And not much later, when another child of his dies—a son of Rhea named Mouth—he sanctified him. And the Phoenicians call this one Death and Pluto. (812: 11) Following these [events] Kronos gives the city Byblos to the goddess Baaltis, who is also [called] Dione. And [he gives] Beirut to Poseidon and to the Kabeiroi and Agrotai and Halieis, who consecrated the remains of Pontos in Beirut. (812: 15) Prior to all this the god Taautos, having imitated the appearances of the assembled gods—of Kronos, and Dagon and the others—formed the sacred figures of the letters. (812: 18) He also devised for Kronos symbols of royalty—four eyes, front and rear, [two of them awake] and two quietly closed; also four wings on his shoulders, two as if flying and two as folded. (812: 21) And this was a symbol, inasmuch as Kronos, when sleeping, kept watch, and waking, took his repose. (812: 23) And in [the case of] the wings similarly, because while resting he flew, and flying he rested. (812: 24) For each of the remaining gods [he made] two wings on their shoulders, inasmuch as they flew together with Kronos. (812: 26) And for him, again, he made two wings on his head, one indicating his mind which was most fit to command, and the other indicating his sensation. (812: 27) And when Kronos went to the land of the south he gave all Egypt to the god Taautos, that it should be a kingdom for him. (812: 29) These things, he says, the seven sons of Sydyk, the Kabeiroi, and their eighth brother Asklepios were the first of all to record, as the god Taautos ordered them.

---

[5] I read ὁ καὶ, see the commentary *ad loc.*

[6] Μονογενῆς here cannot mean "only begotten," since it is clear both from the preceding genealogy and from the following story that Kronos had many sons. So the word must have its well-attested later meaning, "beloved." See Lampe, *Patristic Lexicon*, s.v., no. 2 (and contrast the apologetic argument by Buchsel, "Monogenes," pp. 737-741).

(813: 4) All these things Thabion—who was the very first of all the Phoenicians from the beginning to be a hierophant—allegorized and confused with physical and cosmic events and handed on to the members of religious organizations and to the prophets who founded mysteries. (813: 7) And these, intent on increasing the humbug by every [means], passed [them] on to their successors and converts, of whom one was Syrios,[7] and discoverer of the three letters, brother of Chna whose name was changed[8] to Phoenix.

(Eusebius)

(813: 11) Then he again continues afterwards:

(Philo)

The Greeks, outstripping all [other men] in cleverness first appropriated most [of the stories], and then wrote them up with various embellishments in tragic style and, intending to charm [people] with the pleasures of the myths, decked them out in every way. (813: 14) Hence Hesiod and the famous Cyclic poets fashioned theogonies, and gigantomachies, and titanomachies of their own, and castration stories. And traveling about with these they completely defeated the truth. (813: 17) Our ears, having grown up with forgeries and having been captured many ages in advance, guard as a deposit, as I said at the beginning, that mythology they have received, which (813: 20) aided by time has made its hold difficult to escape, so that the truth seems nonsense and the falsity of the narrative, truth.

---

[7] I read ὧν ἦν καὶ εἷς Σύριος, as suggested by Bunsen. See the discussion in the commentary *ad loc.*

[8] I omit πρώτου, adopting the reading of MS. A. See the discussion in the commentary *ad loc.*

(Eusebius)

(813: 23) Let these passages be quoted from Sanchuniathon's work which was translated by Philo of Byblos and was approved as true by the testimony of Porphyry the philosopher.

iii

811: 24-25 ʼΑστάρτη-γνώμη

Kronos = El supervises or controls the division of the world much as Elioun (= El?)[9] in Deut. 32: 8. Kronos' authority, it would seem, is not challenged, but, at most, voluntary handed on to successors of his own choosing. There is no account in the extant fragments of a younger god arising to contest Kronos' position.[10] This is an obvious difference between Philo's stories and Hesiod: Philo has no one to play the role of Hesiod's Zeus.

While it is clear that El is the unchallenged head of the pantheon in Philo's Euhemeristic account,[11] some have proposed a different status for Ugaritic El. Oldenburg and others have argued that Ugaritic El was originally supreme, but was later challenged, castrated, and replaced by Baal.[12] Pope's conclusions are more moderate than Oldenburg's in that Pope does not discuss El's castration by Baal. Pope would agree, however, that Baal eventually drove El into exile, and replaced him.[13] All of these scholars thus see El as in conflict with Baal, and replaced by him. Given such views of Ugaritic El, the differences between El in Philo and El of Ugarit require explanation. Oldenburg has proposed a "stratification" of the Ugaritic texts: those texts which show El supreme are earliest, while El is replaced only in the later texts. Philo agrees with the earliest strata, and thus preserved intact a tradition about El which goes back to the earliest known strata of Ugaritic mythology.[14]

---

[9] The identity of the Elioun in Deut. 32: 8 is a difficult problem. The comparison with Philo indicates that the role in Deut. was probably originally El's: YHWH was only one of the gods who received a portion from the senior deity El. By the time this tradition was reworked by the author of Deut. 32 an important change had taken place. YHWH had taken over many of El's functions and epithets. Furthermore, the growing conviction that YHWH alone was to be worshipped (see e.g. Deut. 32: 21 and 32: 39) made YHWH's subordination to El intolerable. Elioun therefore becomes understood as an epithet for YHWH. Israel has the distinction of being the portion chosen by the god who was doing the distributing. That god could have taken any nation, but elected Israel. See Ben Sira 17: 17. Among modern scholars see Rofe, *Emunah Bemalachim*, pp. 76-78, and Loewenstamm, "Philon," p. 323. See also Eissfeldt, "El and Yahweh," pp. 29-30.

[10] See Walcot, *Hesiod*, p. 24 and Littleton, "Kingship in Heaven," p. 385.

[11] No scholar, to my knowledge, has proposed any other conclusion, See Schwabl, "Griechischen Theogonien," p. 46; Oldenburg, *Conflict*, p. 104; Miller, "El," pp. 415-418; Littleton, "KIH Theme," p. 101.

Whatever view of Ugaritic El is correct (see below) comparisons between Philo's El and El of Ugarit are problematic. All such comparisons neglect a crucial fact: the iconography of Philo's El (see 812: 18-27 and commentary) clearly differs from that of Ugaritic El. One is represented as having six wings, the other as a bull. Philo's El agrees with images on Byblian coins (down to the Roman period) and is clearly the El of Byblos. The iconography of the two Els differed; so may the myths about them in Byblos and Ugarit. Comparisons between the place of El in the traditions of these two towns are therefore hazardous.[15]

An even more serious objection to Oldenburg's reconstruction and stratification is posed by the fact that the Ugaritic texts do not support the notion of a conflict between Baal and El, of the former castrating and replacing the latter.[16] Mulder has stressed the fragmentary nature of the sources on which Oldenburg built his case.[17] Loewenstamm has argued persuasively that Ugaritic sources contain clear proof that Oldenburg is wrong. Loewenstamm notes that El mourns when Baal is devoured by Mot, but rejoices at Baal's resurrection (67: VI: 11-25; 49: III: 4-21). In the Keret epic, El is still supreme, while in the Aqht cycle, Baal apparently approaches El with Dnil's request for a son (2 Aqht: I: 17).[18] All of these scenes suggest that El and Baal are on good terms, and that Baal acknowledges El's authority. These conclusions are confirmed by the texts which describe Baal and El feasting together at a banquet.[19] Oldenburg's case for a conflict between Baal and El collapses.

---

[12] Oldenburg, *Conflict*, pp. 142-145; Miller, "El," p. 414; Littleton, "KIH Theme," p. 101.

[13] Pope, *El*, pp. 102-103.

[14] Oldenburg, *Conflict*, pp. 142-146.

[15] That the mythology of the various Phoenician cities differed has been clear at several points in this study. See p. 178, 220, 224, and 227. See also Barr, "Philo of Byblos," pp. 45-46.

[16] I have not here presented an argument against Pope's more moderate conclusions, as that question has been discussed above, p. 106, n. 41.

[17] Mulder, "Oldenburg," pp. 364-365.

To conclude, while comparisons between Ugaritic and Byblian El, as argued, are hazardous it would seem that the traditions about El in these two cities were similar. In the mythology of both towns, El delegated authority to the younger gods, while retaining ultimate, and unchallenged supremacy for himself.

According to the reading of the MSS. Kronos approved the rule of three persons: Astarte, Zeus Demarous, *and* Adad King of the Gods. We have seen above, however, that there are good grounds for thinking Demarous a god of the Hadad type.[20] The καὶ between Demarous and Adad should be emended to ὁ καὶ.[21] The highest rulers of the world are therefore Kronos, Astarte, and Zeus Demarous = Hadad.[22]

Astarte is the only one of these gods not to have been discussed in detail.[23] Philo will give more information about her in 811: 25- 812: 4. For the moment it is sufficient to note, with Lokkegaard, that the epithet μεγίστη, "the Greatest," is probably a translation of Phoenician רבת,[24] a title applied to Astarte in many inscriptions.[25] As Astarte is known to have been worshipped in at least Tyre, Sidon, Cyprus, and Carthage, Philo could have been referring to any or all of these cults.[26]

---

[18] Loewenstamm, "Philon," pp. 321-322.

[19] See Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, pp. 20-21, esp. p. 21, n. 51.

[20] See Chapter Eight, pp. 195-197. Cf. Oldenburg, *Conflict*, p. 59.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] These three gods from a trinity, a theological institution characteristic of the Phoenician religion in later antiquity. See Seyrig, "AS 83," pp. 25-26.

[23] For Kronos and Demarous see Chapter Eight, pp. 189, 199-201, and 195-197.

[24] Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 74.

[25] See e.g. KAI 17, line 1; 33, line 3; 81, line 1.

[26] For Tyre see KAI 17 and the Baalu treaty, line 18; Sidon KAI 14; Cyprus, KAI 33; Carthage, KAI 81.

811: 25-812: 1 ἡ δὲ-ταύρου

One of the concerns of this section of the fragments will be to explain the various gods' symbols which Philo has Euhemerized into "marks of royality" of the various mortals. In at least one case, that of Kronos = El, Philo's description can be confirmed by other evidence.[27] Astarte's "mark of royality" is the head of a bull. This is not easy to identify, but it may be Philo's interpretation of the horns and/or a cow's ears worn by numerous female figures on ancient Phoenician stelai and decorative objects;[28] the connection with the motif of "traveling about the world" makes it likely that he had in mind the legend of Io-Isis-Hathor.[29] Another indication of the accuracy of Philo's description may be the place name עשתרת קרנים in Gen. 14: 5.

812: 1-3 περινοστοῦσα-ἀφιέρωσε

Philo is presumably playing with etymologies when he connects Astarte with a star (ἀστήρ).[30] He is now describing Tyrian Astarte: the star was taken to Tyre and consecrated there. Philo had previously associated Astarte with Kronos-El of Byblos and Demarous, although she was associated with Baalshamem and Melqart at Tyre.[31] We have here another example of Philo's combining information from several cities in his work.[32]

The star "fallen from the air" which Astarte found must have been a meteorite. This statement of Philo's may be confirmed by numismatic evidence. An ovoid object, perhaps a meteorite in a portable shrine, is represented on several Tyrian coins of the third century A.D.[33]

812: 3-4 τὴν δὲ-λέγουσι

Philo, as usual, identifies the equivalent Greek and Phoenician gods:

---

[27] See the discussion pp. 225-226.

[28] See Oldenburg, *Conflict*, p. 88; Pope and Rollig, "Syrien," p. 232; Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Etudes*, pp. 88-98.

[29] See Pritchard, *ANEP*, #470, 471, 474, 475, 477 and *Supplement* #829. On Io-Isis-Hathor see Höfer, "Io," cols. 263-270; 278-279.

[30] See Baudissin, *Studien*, I, p. 26.

[31] See Seyrig, "AS 83," pp. 19-20. See further the literature cited and discussion in Teixidor, "BES 1975," #127, pp. 283-284.

[32] Cf. above, n. 15. Cf. also Loewenstamm, "Philon," p. 322.

[33] See Hill, *BMC Phoenicia*, Tyre, #435 and 471. See also Seyrig, "AS 83," p. 22; Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Origine," p. 134, n. 5.

Astarte is Aphrodite. This identification, as Orelli realized, was common in antiquity.[34] Given the beliefs about the goddesses it is understandable.

812: 4-5 καὶ ὁ-βασιλείαν

Athena is here specified as Kronos' daughter rather than Zeus', indicating that Philo is not thinking of the Greek goddess.[35] The specification would suit Ugaritic Anat,[36] the daughter of El.[37] But Athena's rule over Attica indicates that Philo is thinking of the Greek goddess too. We have therefore a case of syncretism. Identification of Anat with Athena has produced a deity with the name of the latter and some characteristics of both. Further evidence of this syncretism can be found in the fact that Athena at Corinth is called Phoenician by a late source.[38] Whether she was actually Phoenician or Greek in origin,[39] her Corinthian title might have suggested to Philo or his sources that at Athens she was of Phoenician origin.[40] Philo's assigning Attica to Athena may therefore be another example of his claim that everything Greek was originally Phoenician (813: 4-22) rather than an indication that he is thinking in Greek terms.[41]

812: 6-9 λοιμοῦ-ἐξαναγκάσας

Child sacrifice, which is to play an important role in the extant fragments (813: 26-814: 17) and which must have been equally important in the entire work (813: 28-814: 2),[42] is here discussed for the first time. Child sacrifice was well known in Phoenicia, and practiced in Africa down to Philo's day.[43] Philo reports (the origin of?) this rite in our passage, and says that the practice was used by Kronos in an offering made to his father Ouranos at a time of pestilence and death. That pestilence and death should have been thought to have followed Ouranos' murder and that the sacrifice was conceived as an atonement are likely, but not stated. An unatoned murder can lead to curses, pestilence, drought and death. To cite one Ugaritic example, Danel curses the land with seven years of drought after the death of Aqhat.[44] In the Bible, one should compare 2 Sam 21: 1-14 with the ritual to prevent similar misfortunes prescribed in Deut, 21: 1-9.[45]

---

[34] Orelli, p. 36, n. 95.

[35] See however Rose, *Handbook*, p. 108; Röscher, *Lexicon*, I, 676. Zeus' paternity of Athena was not unchallenged in Greece.

[36] See Chapter Eight, p. 193 for the discussion of another fragment in which Athena may stand for Anat.

[37] See Kapelrud, *Baal*, p. 64.

[38] Schol. Lyc. *Alex.* 658. Cf. Farnell, *Cults*, Vol. 1, pp. 277ff. on other Phoenician elements in the cult of Athena at Corinth.

[39] See the discussion in Will, *Korinthiaka*, pp. 143-145, repudiating Farnell's conjecture, and adding other—and more important—evidence for Phoenician elements which, however, he rejects. Cf. Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Origine," pp. 146-153.

[40] Du Mesnil du Buisson, "Origine," p. 152.

[41] Even Oldenburg, *Conflict*, p. 86 admits that assigning Athens to Anat=Athena is not Sanchuniathon's doing. See also Troiani, p. 186.

[42] Williams, pp. 180-181 minimizes the importance of child sacrifice in the entire *Phoenician History* in spite of Porphyry's explicit testimony.

Although Philo does not say so, he probably understood the sacrifice of the child as a substitutionary atonement for Kronos.[46] Rather than Kronos dying for his crime against Ouranos, the child is sacrificed. Kronos' circumcision and his imposition of this practice on his "allies" is to be similarly understood.[47] By application of *lex talionis* Kronos should suffer castration. As an attenuated form of punishment Kronos circumcized himself and forced his allies to do likewise.[48] Herodotus informs us that the Phoenicians practiced circumcision,[49] and Philo as a Euhemerist, is probably attempting to explain the origins of this practice through the story of the mortal Kronos.[50]

---

[43] See Chapter Four, pp. 49-50.

[44] See Gordon, *UT*, 1 Aqht: 42-46.

[45] See Von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, pp. 135-137. Rashi's remarks on Deut. 21 : 4 suggest that he (or his sources) understood the ritual similarly. Rashi writes תבא עגלה בת שנתה שלא עשתה פירות ותערף במקום שאינו עושה פירות, לכפר על הריגתו של זה, שלא הניחוהו לעשות פירות. I have long suspected that had Rashi been a folklorist he might have added something like לכפר על חאדמה כ̇די שהאדמה תעשה פירות.

[46] See Frazer, *Golden Bough*, pp. 140-141.

[47] I follow the suggestion of Langrange, p. 392, n. 2. The apotropaic function of circumcision is apparent—although not totally clear—in Exod. 4:24ff, as noted by Loewenstamm, "Philon," p. 327.

[48] Cf. Gen. 17: 23-27 where Abraham circumcizes himself, Ishmael and the members of his household.

[49] Hdt. 2, 104. The sense of Philo's account of Kronos' circumcision has been totally missed by Littleton, "KIH Theme," p. 101 who turns circumcision into self-castration. Symbolically, circumcision atones for castration, but Philo must explain the origin of what was known and done: the Phoenician practice of circumcision. Hence Kronos *must circumcize* (not castrate) himself.

[50] On the use of this passage by Porphyry in his anti-Christian polemic, see Schaublin, "Diodor von Tarsus," pp. 58-60.

812: 9-11 καὶ μετ'-ὀνομάζουσι

This is a repetition of the events narrated in 811: 2 with little added in the repetition. The new facts are that the boy was named Mouth, was consecrated after his death, and was called by the Phoenicians "Thanatos" (Death) and "Pluto."

Orelli was the first to recognize that Mouth must be a transliteration of Hebrew מות.[51] We now know that the word exists in Phoenician[52] and Ugaritic, and that a Ugaritic god of that name plays an important role in the epics.[53] Ugaritic Mot was the god of the netherworld, Baal's opponent, a god with a voracious appetite who swallows Baal but is later beaten by Anat.[54] The Phoenicians of Philo's time evidently understood their traditional pantheon correctly when they translated the name as Death and equated Mouth with Greek Pluto.[55] The transliteration Mouth reflects the pattern of Hebrew (and Phoenician) ת becoming θ in the Septuagint.[56]

812: 11-13 καὶ ἐπὶ-δίδωσι

In the division, Byblos was given to Baaltis or Dione. Baaltis must be a transliteration of the title בעלת, or in fuller form בעלת גבל, a Byblian goddess well known from the inscriptions.[57] The significance of the identification with Dione is uncertain, an uncertainty due largely to the lack of evidence. It should be noted, however, that the goddess Deana appears on a Latin inscription from Ferzol on the western part of the Beqa.[58]

---

[51] Orelli, pp. 37-38, n. 98.

[52] מות as a verb appears in several Neo-Punic inscriptions, e.g. KAI 128, line 3 and 136, line 2.

[53] See Gordon, *UT* #1443, p. 431.

[54] See Kapelrud, *Baal*, pp. 117-125.

[55] Cf. Clemen, pp. 73-74 who inexplicably rejects the connection between Philo's Mouth and Ugaritic Mot.

[56] See Chapter Four, p. 42, n. 6.

[57] See KAI 5, 6, 7, 10, and 11. She is properly introduced by emendation in KAI 4, line 3.

[58] IGLS 2949, Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, pp. 28-29, n. 90 has attempted a different interpretation of Philo's Dione. He suggests that she is a transparent etymological fiction; Dione and Zeus (Dios in the genitive) stand for Elat and El. It should however be noted that the goddess of Byblos is called Baalat, not Elat, in the inscriptions. Secondly, if the name is a play on Zeus (Dios), Baalat would be appropriate, as Baal and Zeus are often identified. Thus, if one were to adopt Cross' suggestion it must be

812: 13-15 Βηρυτὸν-ἀφιέρωσαν

Poseidon is here specified as the god of Beirut.[59] As such he is probably the maritime god who rides a chariot drawn by four hippocamps represented on several Beirutian coins.[60] But Poseidon is not the only ruler of Beirut according to Philo. The Kabeiroi, Agrotai and Halieis share the task. Gruppe and Clemen have seen a representation of this fact in a coin type, first known from the days of Elagabalus, which shows eight figures seated in a circle.[61] This coin, Gruppe and Clemen maintain, shows what Philo describes. This interpretation is likely but should be accepted with some caution as there is no proof that the coin and Philo are necessarily related to each other. Moreover, Philo had eight Kabeiroi (813: 2) who with Poseidon would make nine, rather than eight as on the coin.[62] Another thing to be noticed is the appearance here, in the Byblian story of Kronos, of the Agrotai (808: 20) and Halieis (808: 20) and Kabeiroi (809: 11) from the preceding genealogy, where the first two appear as sons of the founders of Tyre. Evidently these were important deities along the coast and each local genealogy had to account for them in its own way.

The consecration of the remains of Pontos at Beirut is an enigma. It sounds very reminiscent of the myths of Osiris, but the consecrator in the Osiris story is Isis and the locale Byblos.[63] Perhaps a similar tale involving Pontos and Poseidon was told at Beirut, but this is pure conjecture.

812: 15-17 πρὸ δὲ-χαρακτῆρας

Taautos' invention of writing is central to Philo's chain of tradition, discussed in Chapter Five. It is this invention which makes Taautos

---

modified: Zeus (Dios) and Dione stand for the Baal and Baalat of Byblos. The suggestion, as modifed, is attractive but not provable. Moreover, it requires one to accept Dione as an etymological fiction among the Phoenicians, which is difficult given IGLS 2949 which mentions worship of Deana.

[59] See Nonnus, *Dionysiaca*, Books 42-43 in which he tells of Poseidon's marriage to Beroe.

[60] Hill, *BMC Phoenicia*, Berytus #1, and others.

[61] Gruppe, p. 377; Clemen, p. 72. The coin is Hill, *BMC Phoenicia*, Berytus, #206-209.

[62] Cf. Du Mesnil du Buisson, *NE*, p. 77.

[63] See Plutarch, *De Iside*, 357A-D.

the first reliable source of Philo's history. The system of writing is here again explicitly alphabetic, but it has some connections with picture writing as the letters are images of the faces of the gods.[64] The Egyptians did have an alphabet in which some of the signs were pictures.[65]

812: 18-27 ἐπενόησε-αἰσθήσεως

Kronos too has a "mark of royalty" devised for him by Taautos, four eyes—two open,[66] and two shut—and four wings—one pair as if flying and the other folded. The symbolism of these eyes and wings is interpreted as meaning that Kronos was awake while resting and resting while awake; resting while flying and flying while resting. The other gods were clearly inferior, possessing only one set of wings. Kronos also had two wings on his head.

Kronos = El who is represented in this manner is clearly different from the El of the Ugaritic texts whose epithet is *ṯr il*, "bull El."[67] Ugaritic monuments have also taught that this epithet was taken literally; El was represented as a bull.[68] Philo's Kronos = El must therefore be derived from a different tradition. Nor is this tradition hard to identify. Since at least the time of Lagrange, scholars have pointed to a nude figure with six wings who appears on some Byblian coins beginning in the Seleucid period.[69] These coins clearly present the sort of figure Philo was describing, so Philo's Kronos = El in this passage must be the Byblian version of the god (as we should have expected, since this section follows the Byblian theogony, in which

---

[64] The "assembled gods" in Philo looks like a rendering of Ugaritic *mpḫrt bn il* or *pḫr ilm* (Gordon, *UT*, 17: 7 and 2: 17 to note only a few passages), or of Byblian מפחרת אל גבל KAI 4, line 4.

[65] See Gardiner, *Egyptian Grammar*, pp. 6-8 and pp. 25-29. On the nature of Philo's supposed Phoenician hieroglyphs see also above, p. 81.

[66] The text is obviously incomplete. Jacoby's suggestion makes good sense.

[67] Gordon, *UT*, Krt: 76-77. Pope, *El*, p. 35.

[68] See Schaeffer, "El et Baal," p. 9.

[69] Lagrange, p. 386. Cooke, *Textbook*, p. 350. For pictures of these coins see Hill, *BMC Phoenicia*, Byblos, #12, 16 (Plate XII,8) and others. A clearer picture in Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Etudes*, p. 57. Four and six winged supernatural beings are fairly common, e.g. Isaiah 6 : 2; Ezechiel 1 : 6.

Byblos is the first city founded in Phoenicia and is founded by Kronos, 810: 14).[70]

Note that Philo speaks of eyes and wings as "marks of royalty," though very few kings have four eyes or any wings at all. Presumably Philo has chosen these terms to impose his euhemeristic theory on the material. The four eyes and wings were common attributes of a deity. Compare the four eyes and four ears of Marduk which give him omniscience in the Enuma Elish 95-98.[71]

If this interpretation is correct, Philo's Euhemerism remains apparent even in these lines of the fragments.[72] If this is so, the phrases in which the characters are called gods (for example 812: 13 θεᾷ Βααλτίδι, 812: 15 θεὸς Τάαυτος, and 812: 16 συνόντων θεῶν), pose an obvious problem.[73] The persistence of Philo's Euhemerism noted above, however, excludes certain solutions for this apparent contradiction. Clearly, one ought not assume that Philo suddenly deserted his pet theory in the few phrases which seem inappropriate for a Euhemerist; Philo seems to have been scrupulously faithful to that system throughout the *History*. The suggestion that these phrases are insertions from another author or source is also implausible: the few phrases are imbedded in a Euhemeristic whole so complete that the possibility of conflation of sources is excluded.[74] One is therefore obliged to search for an explanation of how a good Euhemerist like Philo could have written the phrases in 812: 13, 15, 16 and elsewhere.

I would suggest that the dilemma is false. A good Euhemerist could write θεὸς Τάαυτος etc., yet remain faithful to the system. Euhemerus himself wrote that Zeus was accorded divine honors while alive,[75] and was publicly proclaimed a god before his death.[76] Dionysos Skytobrachion, the other major Euhemeristic historian, called some of his characters "gods" without any further qualification.[77] Euhemerists therefore accorded divine status to "mortals" while these "mortals" were still alive.[78] Philo's own methodological comments, in 806: 1-7, are consistent with this interpretation. Philo's use of phrases such as θεὸς Τάαυτος, therefore poses no problem.

---

[70] Several scholars, including Oldenburg (see above, p. 217) and Du Mesnil du Buisson, *Etudes*, pp. 56-57 seem to forget the differences in iconography between Philo's El and that of Ugarit. They write as if the two Els were one and neglect the obvious fact that Philo's El is Byblian. Cf. also Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, pp. 41-42 who commits the same error.

[71] Translation in *ANET*, p. 62a. Troiani, p. 190 sees Philo's explanation of the eyes and wings as symbolical and *allegorical.* He then uses this to support his conclusion that Philo used an allegorizing source (see below n. 74). Troiani's explanation of Philo's comments on the wings is, however, incorrect. Philo is attempting a Euhemeristic interpretation of the iconography of the gods. As such, some symbolism is inevitable, but note that Philo's real concern is to explain the origin of the symbols in human terms.

[72] See also below, pp. 242-243.

[73] See p. 48, n. 26. See also Du Mesnil du Buisson, *NE*, pp. 72-73, and Barr, "Philo of Byblos," pp. 34-35.

[74] Troiani, pp. 193-194. See also Du Mesnil du Buisson, *NE*, pp. 72-73.

812: 27-29 ἐλθὼν-γένηται

The journey of Kronos to the south is unexplained; perhaps it was invented to maintain his suzerainty over Egypt. The priority of Phoenicia to Egypt has hitherto not been stressed, but see Chapter Ten, p. 256.

Taautos received Egypt. I have rendered βασίλειον, as "kingdom," a meaning it can take in the later Greek.[79]

812: 29-813: 3 ταῦτα-Τάαυτος

Taautos (= Hermes), as Philo consistently maintained, was responsible for recording these events. Euhemerus too makes Hermes the recorder of divine history.[80] We have here another of the agreements between Philo and Euhemeristic historiography. Philo adds a touch of local color not found in Euhemerus: Taautos' amanuenses were the seven sons of Sydyk, the Kabeiroi and their eighth brother Asklepios.

The fragments have already mentioned that Sydyk was the father of the Kabeiroi (809: 11) and of Asklepios (811: 5-6). The former report stands at the end of the Tyrian genealogy which leads to Sydyk; the latter report is inserted in the Byblian mythology where Sydyk suddenly appears without explanation, is related to nobody and plays no part in the story—perhaps he got in as spouse of the "Titanids" mentioned in the preceeding lines. The two notices about Sydyk's offspring are completely different, if not contradictory, but are here reconciled by making Asklepios the eighth son.[81] Asklepios was commonly identified with the Phoenician god Eshmun.[82] Eshmun's name, we know, was something of an enigma, but some connected it with the number eight (שמן, אשמן).[83] When Philo makes Asklepios the eighth brother he must have been thinking of Eshmun and adopting the interpretation of the name derived from the number eight.

---

[75] *FGrH* 63 F 23.

[76] *FGrH* 63 F 2, 9.

[77] *FGrH* 32 F 7,60,4. See also F 8,73,6.

[78] See Jacoby, "Euhemeros," cols. 964-965.

[79] For βασίλειον meaning kingdom see Lampe, *Patristic Lexicon* s.v. βασίλειος B4.

[80] *FGrH* 63 F 3,46,8.

A fragment of Damascius' *Vita Isidori*, whose relevance was already recognized by Orelli,[84] sheds much light on our passage.

> ὅτι ὁ ἐν Βηρυτῷ, φησίν, Ἀσκληπιὸς οὐκ ἔστιν Ἕλλην οὐδὲ Αἰγύπτιος, ἀλλά τις ἐπιχώριος φοῖνιξ. Σαδύκῳ γὰρ ἐγένοντο παῖδες, οὕς Διοσκούρους ἑρμηνεύουσι καὶ Καβείρους. ὄγδοος δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ Ἔσμουνος, ὅν Ἀσκληπιὸν ἑρμηνεύουσιν. οὗτος κάλλιστος ὢν θέαν καὶ νεανίας ἰδεῖν ἀξιάγαστος, ἐρώμενος γέγονεν, ὥς φησιν ὁ μῦθος, Ἀστρονόης θεοῦ Φοινίσσης, μητρὸς θεῶν. εἰωθώς τε κυνηγετεῖν ἐν ταῖσδε ταῖς νάπαις ἐπειδὴ ἐθεάσατο τὴν θεὸν αὐτὸν ἐκκυνηγετοῦσαν καὶ φεύγοντα ἐπιδιώκουσαν καὶ ἤδη καταληψομένην, ἀποτέμνει πελέκει τὴν αὐτὸς αὑτοῦ παιδοσπόρον φύσιν. ἡ δὲ τῷ πάθει περιαληγήσασα, καὶ Παιᾶνα καλέσασα, τὸν νεανίσκον τῇ τε ζωογόνῳ θέρμῃ ἀναζωπυρήσασα θεὸν ἐποίησεν, Ἔσμουνον ὑπὸ Φοινίκων ὠνομασμένον ἐπὶ τῇ θέρμῃ τῆς ζωῆς. οἱ δὲ τὸν Ἔσμουνον ὄγδοον ἀξιοῦσιν ἑρμηνεύειν ὅτι ὄγδοος ἦν τῷ Σαδύκῳ παῖς.[85]

> The Asklepios in Beirut, he says, is neither Greek nor Egyptian, but rather a native Phoenician. For to Sadykos were born the children whom they interpret[86] as the Dioskouroi and the Kabeiroi. Eighth, after these, was

---

[81] Clapham, p. 145 combines all these notices without noticing the different provenance of the stories.

[82] E.g. KAI 66. See Cumont, "Eshmun," col. 678 and Baudissin, *Adonis*, pp. 219-228.

[83] See the passage from Damascius cited below. Cf. Ugaritic *ṯmnt* whose name is usually explained (e.g. by Pope and Röllig, "Syrien," pp. 293-294) as derived from the number eight.

[84] Orelli, p. 39, n. 105. Baudissin, *Adonis*, pp. 339-345 also utilized this passage extensively.

[85] Damascius, *Vita Isidori Fragmenta* (Ed. Zintzen), Frag. 348.

[86] ἑρμηνεύω = interpret, throughout this passage (with the exception of the final phrase), means *interpretatio Graeca*.

> born Esmounos, whom they interpret as Asklepios. Being the fairest in appearance and a young man worthy to view with admiration, he was beloved, so the story goes, by the Phoenician goddess Astronoe, mother of the gods. He was accustomed to hunt in these woodland glens; but when he saw the goddess hunting him, and following hard after him when he fled, and already about to overtake him, he emasculated himself with an axe. Greatly distressed by his suffering she summoned Paian[87] and having rekindled the flame of life in the young man with her lifegiving warmth she made him a god. He was named Esmounos by the Phoenicians with reference to the warmth of life. But some think Esmounos means the eighth, since he was the eighth child of Sadykos.[88]

The similarities between Damascius and Philo are numerous. Both speak of the Phoenician Asklepios = Eshmun, the son of Sadykos (Sydyk in Philo); Sydyk is unknown aside from these two texts. Moreover, Damascius specifies the sons of Sydyk as "Dioskouroi and Kabeiroi," in the same order as Philo in 809: 11, and reconciles that passage with the report that Sydyk's son was Eshmun by making Asklepios = Eshmun the eighth son, in the same way as Philo (813: 2). In addition, both Damascius and Philo know the explanation of Eshmun's name from the number eight, from the fact that he was Sydyk's eighth son. Finally the Beirutian setting of Damascius' story properly disturbed Baudissin. Eshmun, as we know from inscriptions, was worshipped primarily at Sidon and there is no literary evidence for a cult of Eshmun at Beirut.[89] Yet, Baudissin argues, Philo seems to share this disturbing feature as his Asklepios is the brother of the Kabeiroi who are among the "mortal rulers" of Beirut (812: 13).[90]

Damascius was quite well read in Phoenician matters. It is, for example, thanks to him that the summaries of the cosmogonies of

---

[87] The meaning of this phrase is obscure. See Baudissin, *Adonis*, p. 237, n. 2.

[88] Translation after Edelstein, *Asclepius*, Vol. 1, pp. 423-424.

[89] Baudissin, *Adonis*, p. 214, 233, 340. The relevant inscriptions are KAI 14, line 17; 15; 16. Perhaps one should add Tyre on the basis of Punic KAI 66. The Baalu treaty, which mentions Eshmun (line 14) would confirm this suggestion. The numismatic evidence will be discussed in the following note.

[90] Baudissin, *Adonis*, p. 214, 233, 340. Gods with snakes appear on the coins of at least three Phoenician towns—Beirut, Carne and Sidon. See Hill, *BMC Phoenicia*, Berytus, #215 (Elagabalus); Carne #3 (221/0 B.C.); Sidon #321 (Alexander Severus). If all these gods are Asklepios = Eshmun (as Hill believes) the Beirutian coin would confirm Philo and Damascius, and prove that Eshmun was worshipped at Beirut.

Mochos and of the Sidonians have been preserved.[91] While there is no evidence that Damascius had read Philo, the similarities in the above passages make the supposition likely. Therefore we must consider the possibility that in the story of Asklepios and Astronoe Damascius has retold an unrecognized fragment of Philo's *Phoenician History*. Moreover, if Damascius is quoting Philo another part of his account of Asklepios becomes intelligible. Two explanations of Eshmun's name are given, one as derived from the life giving warmth—as derived from Hebrew אש,[92] and Eshmun as derived from the number eight.[93] We know that Philo often discussed the alternate meanings of names in his work (807: 26-808: 2).

In spite of these similarities, it is impossible to prove that Damascius must have derived his information from Philo; he might have had a different Phoenician source. Moreover, Damascius' report that Asklepios, having died, was resurrected and made into a god by Astronoe,[94] is inconsistent with Philo's Euhemerism. Philo, I believe, would have written that Astronoe *consecrated* the mortal Asklepios as a god.[95] This trait, however, may have been added by Damascius in his retelling of Philo's story.[96] In sum, the supposition that Damascius was using Philo remains likely but uncertain.

A passage of Pausanias is also relevant to Philo's statements about Asklepios.[97] Pausanias, Philo's younger contemporary, visited a shrine of Asklepios in Achaia. There he met an argumentative[98] Sidonian.

---

[91] See *FGrH* 784 F 4.

[92] This interpretation of Damascius was suggested by Baudissin, *Adonis*, p. 203.

[93] Baudissin, *Adonis*, pp. 214-215, believed that Damascius derived the explanation of Eshmun from the number eight from Philo.

[94] On Astronoe see Seyrig, "AS 83," pp. 19-21. Anat may have revived Aqhat in lost sections of that epic. See Ginsberg, *ANET*, p. 155.

[95] Philo habitually writes that mortals were consecrated by their survivors. See 806: 1-5; 809: 20; 812: 9-10.

[96] If one believes that Damascius was reworking what he read in Philo (or some other Phoenician author) perhaps Asklepios' self castration too is adventitious. It certainly looks as if derived from the mythology of Atthis. See Baudissin, *Adonis*, p. 340.

[97] Baudissin, *Adonis*, pp. 221, 239, 245, 252, 342, began to see the significance of this passage.

[98] The attitude of the Sidonian and the sorts of claims he makes will be most important for our understanding of the intellectual climate in which Philo wrote, a topic reserved for the final chapter.

ἐν τούτῳ τοῦ ᾿Ασκληπιοῦ τῷ ἱερῷ ἐς ἀντιλογίαν ἀφίκετο ἀνήρ μοι Σιδόνιος, ὁ ἐγνωκέναι τὰ ἐς τὸ θεῖον ἔφασκε Φοίνικας τά τε ἄλλα Ἕλληνων βέλτιον καὶ δὴ καὶ ᾿Ασκληπιῷ πατέρα μὲν σφᾶς ᾿Απόλλωνα ἐπιφημίζειν, θνητὴν δὲ γυναῖκα οὐδεμίαν μητέρα. ᾿Ασκληπιὸν μὲν γὰρ ἀέρα γένει τε ἀνθρώπων εἶναι καὶ πᾶσιν ὁμοίως ζῴοις ἐπιτήδειον πρὸς ὑγίειαν, ᾿Απόλλωνα δὲ ἥλιον, καὶ αὐτὸν ὀρθότατα ᾿Ασκληπιῷ πατέρα ἐπονομάζεσθαι, ὅτι ἐς τὸ ἁρμόζον ταῖς ὥραις ποιούμενος ὁ ἥλιος τὸν δρόμον μεταδίδωσι καὶ τῷ ἀέρι ὑγιείας.

> In this sanctuary of Asklepios a man of Sidon entered upon an argument with me. He declared that the Phoenicians had better notions about the gods than the Greeks, giving as an instance that to Asklepios they assign Apollo as father, but no mortal woman as his mother. Asklepios, he went on, is air, bringing health to mankind and to all animals likewise; Apollo is the sun, and most rightly is he named father of Asklepios, because the sun, by adapting his course to the seasons, imparts to the air its healthfulness.[99]

When Pausanias' Sidonian said Asklepios he must have meant Eshmun, and made the same identification as Philo and the inscription.[100] This Sidonian interprets the gods and their functions in physical terms; Asklepios = Eshmun is the air, Apollo the sun. Philo disagreed vigorously with such interpretations (813: 5-6). Nevertheless, one aspect of the Sidonian's speech agrees with what Philo writes. Asklepios = Eshmun's father, according to the Sidonian, is Apollo = the sun. Philo has Sydyk as Asklepios' father, but Sydyk as we have seen is part of the pair Misor and Sydyk, a pair with important solar associations.[101] Thus both Philo and Pausanias' Sidonian make Asklepios = Eshmun's father a god associated with the sun.[102]

---

[99] Paus. 7,23, 7-8. Translation from LCL.

[100] So Baudissin, *Adonis*, p. 221.

[101] See Chapter Seven, p. 176.

[102] The Sidonian's Asklepios is a god of health, for both men and animals. This may reflect the functions of Eshmun in the Baalu treaty, lines 14-17. Baudissin, *Adonis*, p. 342 was already close to this point. See also McCasland, "Religious Healing," pp. 27-32.

813: 4-7 ταῦτα πάντα-προφήταις

This passage, very similar to 805: 4-19,[103] contains the history of the school of Philo's opponents. Thabion took the true accounts of Taautos, allegorized them, and mixed them with physical and cosmic processes and handed the distorted versions on to his followers.

Thabion has been generally recognized as a semitic personal name,[104] perhaps going back as far as Ugarit.[105] An interesting explanation of Thabion's name was proposed by Bernays, who saw the name as a transliteration of טביום. טביום, Bernays argues, is a semitic translation of Euhemeros, so that Philo's Thabion is *the* Euhemeros.[106] This explanation might be possible, were it not for the fact that Thabion is an allegorizer, one of Philo's opponents, and anything but a Euhemerist.

In both 805: 7 and 813: 6-7 Philo maintains that religious associations and mystery cults were founded, based on the distorted versions of the myths. The fragments, unfortunately, do not specify which cults Philo had in mind.

813: 7-10 οἱ δὲ-Φοίνικος

According to the reading of the MSS. one of those who eventually got the incorrect versions of the stories was Eisirios, the brother of Chna whose name was changed to Phoenix. Chna, as Bochart saw, must be כנען, and Phoenix must be Phoenician.[107] Eisirios' name is particularly difficult once one realizes the names of his brother. I have therefore adopted Bunsen's emendation of the passage: ὧν ἦν καὶ εἷς Σύριος, "one of whom was Syrios";[108] Syrios, the Syrian, is a proper brother for Canaan and Phoenix.[109]

---

[103] See above, pp. 64, n. 5 & 82-83 where the similarities are discussed and where the two sets of passages are analyzed as part of the well-known oriental reaction against the Greeks.

[104] Cf. Lokkegaard, "Sanchuniathon," p. 52, n. 1.

[105] See Dussaud, "Mythologie Phénicienne," pp. 377-388. *PRU* III 16.249, line 13.

[106] Bernays *ap*. Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 838, n. 9. TB Baba Batra 12b.

[107] The two names mean the same thing, purple. See DeVaux, "Canaan," p. 23 who follows Speiser, "Phoinikes," pp. 121-126. Cf. Astour, *HS*, pp. 146-147.

[108] Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 838, n. 10. Cf. Clemen, pp. 13-14.

[109] Cf. Dussaud, "Invention," p. 337. Cf. also Nautin, "Valeur Doc.," p. 575, and Humbert, "Asher," p. 62.

Syrios is "the inventor of the three letters," a particularly obscure phrase. No satisfactory explanation of the phrase had been offered prior to the discovery of the Ugaritic texts.[110] Eissfeldt, excited by the new insights offered by the Ugaritic myths, believed this old difficulty could also be resolved. Ugaritic seems to have three unusual letters, the three forms of aleph.[111] Eisirios, Eissfeldt suggests, is incorrect and should be *Ugr*, the eponymous hero of Ugarit. The three letters he discovered are then the three Ugaritic alephs.[112] Eissfeldt's suggestion is unacceptable on several grounds. Corruption of *Ugr* into Eisirios is incredible. The order in which Ugaritic scribes learned the alphabet indicates that only two of the alephs, *i* and *u*, were unusual.[113] Moreover, it seems unlikely that Philo's sources were so old that he could reflect a legendary explanation of this unusual aspect of Ugaritic. In all instances hitherto considered, whenever a Ugaritic passage explains or illuminates something in the fragments there has been an apparent gap, usually chronological, between Philo's information and Ugarit.[114]

Another proposal, that of Dussaud, should be considered. Dussaud suggests that τριῶν be emended to πρώτων.[115] The passage therefore discusses the invention of the first letters, and the emendation is not difficult since there are good grounds for suspecting πρώτου in 813: 10 below. The difficulty with this suggestion is that it replaces Taautos as the inventor of writing. Taautos' role as the inventor of writing is far too central to be displaced without excellent reasons.

A partial solution to this enigma may be possible if one follows the lines of analysis adopted thus far. I would propose that some aspects of this enigma can be explained if one looks carefully at ideas current when Philo wrote and at Philo's methods for compiling the *History*. Greek science of Philo's day explained the discovery of the alphabet as a gradual process. Pliny credits Kadmos with bringing a sixteen letter alphabet to Greece. Palamades, at the time of the Trojan

---

[110] See e.g. Bernays *ap.* Bunsen, Vol. 5, p. 839, n. 10.

[111] Gordon, *UT*, 3.1, pp. 11-15.

[112] Eissfeldt, *RS*, pp. 58-62. Clemen, p. 13 agrees with Eissfeldt.

[113] See Gordon *UT*, 3.1, pp. 11-12.

[114] See e.g. the discussion of El and Mot in Chapter Six, pp. 106-108; 111-113 and of Chousor in Chapter Seven, pp. 166-167.

[115] Dussaud, "Invention," p. 337. Clapham, p. 137 agrees with Dussaud.

War, added four more letters; Simonides, the lyric poet, added the four remaining letters. Aristotle, according to Pliny, believed that the alphabet originally had eighteen letters, and that Epicharmus (rather than Palamades) added two more.[116] Tacitus reports Athenian, Theban, and Argive accounts of the invention of a sixteen letter alphabet, with other letters added by Simonides. Tacitus remarks that the Emperor Claudius was inspired by these precedents, and added three letters to the Roman alphabet, letters which were used on public documents during Claudius' lifetime, but became obsolete after his death.[117] Philo's Syrios, inventor of the three letters, fits this pattern perfectly, and does not challenge Taautos' primacy as the inventor of writing. That is, the educated reader of Philo's day had become accustomed to (and apparently expected) a primary inventor of writing and one or more other inventors who added letters. Philo's Taautos and Syrios would meet these expectations.

The reason Philo chose Syrios as the supplementary inventor is clarified by the same passage from Pliny discussed above. Pliny writes that "others think they [i.e. letters] were discovered by Syrians—*alii apud Syros repertas volunt.*"[118] Diodorus Siculus confirms Pliny's statement, and shows that the claims of the Syrians were forcefully presented. He writes:

> πρὸς δὲ τοὺς λέγοντας ὅτι Σύροι μὲν εὑρεταὶ τῶν γραμμάτων εἰσί παρὰ δὲ τούτων Φοίνικες μαθόντες τοῖς Ἕλλησι παραδεδώκασιν, οὗτοι δ' εἰσὶν οἱ μετὰ Κάδμου πλεύσαντες εἰς τὴν Εὐρώπην, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τοὺς Ἕλληνας τὰ γράμματα Φοινίκεια προσαγορεύειν.

> And in reply to those who say that the Syrians are the discoverers of the letters, the Phoenicians having learned them from the Syrians and then passed them on to the Greeks, and that these Phoenicians are those who sailed to Europe with Kadmos and this is the reason why the Greeks call the letters "Phoenician..."[119]

---

[116] Pliny, *N.H.* 7, 192-193.

[117] Tacitus, *Ann.* 11, 14.

[118] Pliny, *N.H.* 7, 192.

[119] D.S., 5, 74, 1. Translation from LCL. See also Eusebius, *P.E.* 10, 5, 2 and Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1, 16 p. 307 who are both probably dependent on Pliny, Diodorus Siculus, and Philo of Byblos.

Diodorus thus testifies to the existence of a debate between Phoenicians and Syrians over who discovered writing. I would suggest that Philo has dealt with this debate as he dealt with other conflicts between local myths—by combining and harmonizing them.[120] He has made the Phoenician Taautos the primary inventor, while Syrios added three letters.[121]

Philo's usual Pan-Phoenician tendencies (See pp. 82-83, 256, 267-268) remain apparent. The major inventor of writing is the Phoenician Taautos. Indeed, the Syro-Phoenician dispute noted by Diodorus is alive in Philo, who makes Syrios one of the representatives of the humbuggery he hates.

I still do not know to which alphabet Philo was referring, or to which three letters of the alphabet. Nevertheless, the main sense of Philo's remarks is now clear.

The MSS. of the *P.E.* differ for 813: 10. MSS. ONV all read τοῦ πρώτου μετονομασθέντος Φοίνικος, while MS. A omits πρώτου. Editors of the text have disagreed over the proper reading, with Gifford and Jacoby adopting the former reading, Mras and Williams the latter.[122] The reading of MS. A, omitting πρώτου, is clearly preferable. The word makes little sense and its presence can be readily explained as an insertion by analogy to 813: 4-5 where Thabion is spoken of as πάμπρωτος τῶν ... Φοινίκων.

813: 11-22 εἶθ'-ἀλήθειαν

In these lines Philo presents his theory to explain the relationship between his account of the wars of Kronos and Ouranos and the account in Hesiod and other Greek authors. He realizes that an attentive reader will have noticed both similarities and differences between his story and Hesiod's. Accordingly, he tries to explain both. What is similar is easy: Hesiod and the other Greeks learned versions of the Phoenician story (813: 14-17). Hence the differences too become comprehensible. Hesiod learnt only a *version* of the truth, a version distorted by Thabion and his successors and further embellished by later Greeks (813: 11-14; 17-22).

---

[120] See above, p. 218, n. 15.

[121] Eissfeldt, *RS*, p. 61, n. 1 was aware of the Pliny and Tacitus passages cited. He did not see the interpretation I have proposed because he was blinded by concentration on Ugaritic explanations.

[122] Jacoby: see the critical apparatus *ad loc*, similarly Mras and Gifford in their respective editions of the *P.E.* Williams, p. 115.

Philo's theory is suspect. Even if he himself was not responsible for the similarities between his story and Hesiod's, yet by his time Phoenicians had been reading Greek literature for several centuries and could have produced a text modeled on Hesiod.[123] Moreover, his explanation of the differences is part of the oriental reaction against Greek mythology and culture popular in his day.[124] As such, it may be rather propaganda than history. With these considerations in mind the detailed analysis of Philo's theory can begin.

His assertion of Hesiod's dependence is based on similarities between the two stories. Hesiod wrote a theogony; Philo's version, in its pre-Euhemeristic form, was also a theogony. Specific similarities include the marriage of an earth goddess and the sky god, the castration of the sky god by his son who is allied with his mother against his father.[125] But these similarities are no proof that such stories were native to Phoenicia, told by Phoenicians, and not made up from Hesiod,[126] and λοχήσας of 811: 15 suggests at least some superficial borrowings from Hesiod.

Can other evidence for Philo's theory be found? First, there is the fact that Philo identifies Kronos with the Phoenician El. Ouranos and Ge are the pair *ars w šmm* שמין וארק known from Ugaritic and the Sfire treaty respectively.[127] Philo's main characters are thus Phoenician; this argues for the Phoenician origin of the stories—though not very strongly; one would expect a Phoenician retelling to have a local cast.

Ugaritic mythology helps. The wars of Pontos and Demarous in Philo resemble those of Baal and Yam.[128] But in more important points Ugarit offers little to confirm the Phoenician origin of Philo's story of Ouranos, Ge and Kronos.[129] Indeed the differences between Philo and Ugarit are at least (if not more) impressive than the similarities. Ugaritic El is benevolent; Philo's Kronos = El harsh.[130] Ugaritic El seems to have no predecessors, while Philo has Elioun two generations older than El.[131] Finally, none of the known Ugaritic myths employs the castration motif.[132]

---

[123] West, *Theogony*, pp. 27-28 recognizes this obvious point. Cf. Walcot, *Hesiod*, pp. 17-18.

[124] See the discussion in Chapter Five, pp. 82-83.

[125] I shall discuss the Hittite texts later in this chapter.

[126] Many scholars who studied Philo during the nineteenth century held the opinion that the stories were simply made up from Hesiod.

[127] See Chapter Eight, pp. 187-189.

[128] See Chapter Eight, pp. 195-197.

The most likely explanation of these facts was proposed above (p. 225): Philo's account is centered in Byblos, and his Kronos = El is represented on Byblian coins. If this story is based on the mythology and pantheon of any Phoenician town, it should be Byblos, and not Ugarit. Perhaps Byblian mythology (otherwise totally unknown) differed from that of Ugarit. In Byblos El may have had some predecessors and the castration motif may have been used. This is unfounded conjecture, but possible.[133]

The differences between Philo and Hesiod argue for a Phoenician origin of Philo's story. Unlike Hesiod, Philo has an odd thirty-two year interval between Ouranos' deposition and castration, thirty-two years during which Ouranos attempts to regain his position.[134] Philo has no real equivalent of Hesiod's Zeus, and Philo's Kronos is the actual ruler of the world.[135] The conflict between Ouranos and Ge originates for different reasons in the two authors.[136] There is, therefore, much in Philo not to be found in Hesiod. Had Philo made up his story from Hesiod we should not have expected such important differences.[137]

---

[129] A Ugaritic text discussed by Güterbock, *Kumarbi*, p. 112 equates El and Kumarbi. This does not necessarily mean that similar myths were told of both gods. The similarities which led to the identification might lie elsewhere. Cf. Littleton, "Kingship in Heaven," p. 385.

[130] See commentary on 810: 20.

[131] See Chapter Eight, pp. 185-186.

[132] Littleton, "Kingship in Heaven," p. 399 invents the idea that the Baal of the Phoenician myth, "forces [El] to castrate self." If Oldenburg, *Conflict*, pp. 112-121 is correct, Ugaritic El is castrated by Baal. But as Mulder, "Oldenburg," p. 365 comments, "*la castration d'El par Baal n'est pas prouvable sur la base des textes ougaritiques. C'est une hypothèse pure.*" See further the commentary on 811: 25, and p. 222, n. 49.

[133] Philo's El, after all, is not the Bull El of Ugarit, but the figure on Byblian coins as was discussed above.

[134] See Chapter Eight, pp. 191, 194-195.

[135] Above, pp. 217-218.

[136] See Chapter Eight, pp. 190-191.

[137] Cf. Plutarch, *De Iside*, 357A-C, obviously based on the *Hymn to Demeter* 98ff.

Therefore Philo must have been following some non-Hesiodic tradition and in these circumstances it would seem most likely that this tradition was Byblian.

Our first question is therefore answered. The stories Philo presents were told by Phoenicians of Byblos and were not simply made up from Hesiod by Philo or some other Phoenician. The Byblian tale may have been retouched by Philo or someone else to look more like Hesiod (a possibility to be discussed below), but in its essentials it is a native Byblian myth.[138]

What was the relationship of this Byblian myth to Hesiod? The two stories are not likely to be totally independent, they are too similar. The differences prohibit any direct dependence, whether of Philo on Hesiod or (as Philo claims) of Hesiod on Philo's sources. Nor can the differences be explained away as Philo attempts—as distortion by Thabion, his successors and the Greeks. There are no apparent motives for the specific differences, which might lead us to attribute them to Greek revisers.

I suggest that Philo and Hesiod represent two versions of a common mythological theme of the eastern Mediterranean world, the theme of "Kingship in Heaven." Stories of the succession of divine kings were told by nearly all the peoples, with each nation telling a version in which their gods were the heroes. Philo and Hesiod preserve a Byblian and a Greek version respectively.

Other versions of this common theme are not hard to find. Hittite texts preserve the myth of Anu, a sky god, second in the list of divine rulers. Anu is castrated and deposed by his son Kumarbi who replaces his father as divine ruler. The other columns of the text are badly broken and certainty is impossible, but it seems that Anu attempts to regain his position with the help of the storm god. In the end Kumarbi loses, and is himself deposed by the storm god.[139] Another set of tablets continues this myth and tells how Kumarbi attempted to regain his former position by engendering a monster who challenged the storm god with some success at first, but ultimately was defeated.[140]

---

[138] West, *Theogony*, pp. 27-28 considered this the most important question to be answered concerning Philo's sources, and reached essentially the same answer though from somewhat different considerations and with minor reservations. See also Loewenstamm, "Philon," p. 318; Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, pp. 64-66.

[139] Text in *ANET*, pp. 120-121.

The similarities between these Hittite myths and Philo are apparent. Both have the sky god, second in a list of four divine rulers, castrated by his son. In both the deposed sky god plots to regain his former position. There are, however, equally apparent differences: the method of castration is not the same, nor is the role of the fourth god equivalent—the Hittite storm god is much more active than Philo's Zeus Demarous. Zeus Demarous never challenges or replaces Kronos = El in anything like the manner in which the storm god challenges Kumarbi. Moreover, in spite of the mention of Typhon (811: 8) Philo lacks the account of the challenge by a monster. Finally, the Hittite myth has no equivalent to Philo's Ge.[141]

Comparing the Hittite version to Hesiod yields another set of similarities and differences. Hesiod and the Kumarbi stories share the motif of the castration of the sky god by his son, the subsequent divine wars and challenges, and the fight of the young weather god against a monster. Nevertheless, Hesiod has only three divine generations, his sky god does not actively seek to regain his lost status, and Hesiodic Ge has no equivalent. Finally, Walcot has argued that while Hesiod's Zeus is invincible, the Hittite weather god loses the first engagement.[142]

The final version of this theme to be considered is the Babylonian. The Enuma Elish tells the story of Apsu, Ea, Tiamat, Kingu and Marduk. A theme common to Hesiod, Philo, and the Kumarbi material is missing in the Enuma Elish—the castration of the sky god.[143] But Apsu is deposed by Ea. He vanishes from the scene and the text narrates at great length the defeat of Tiamat and Kingu by the young victorious god Marduk.

---

[140] *Ibid.*, pp. 121-125. Another version of this theme may be the Egyptian story of Seth and Horus, *ANET*, pp. 14-17. The Egyptian account, however, has only the theme in common and few details. For a discussion of the relationship between these Near Eastern Myths and the Jewish legends of the castration of Noah, see Baumgarten, "Myth and Midrash," pp. 70-71.

[141] See Walcot, *Hesiod*, pp. 24-25 for a similar analysis, West, *Theogony*, p. 27 says that Philo has no character to match Tiamat or Hesiod's Ge; this is clearly incorrect, given the role of Philo's Ge. Only the Hittite version lacks a female lead.

[142] Walcot, *Hesiod*, p. 26.

[143] Littleton, "Kingship in Heaven," p. 393 finds a castration episode in the Enuma Elish. He argues that Ea, before killing Apsu, "tears off the former's tiara or halo (symbolic, perhaps of sovereignty and the masculine vigor that accompanies it) and

The comparison of the four myths confirms the conclusions reached above. These stories have not simply been borrowed from one nation by the other. The differences are too marked and the characters too integrated in the mythology of each people. They are rather four versions of the common mythological theme of Kingship in Heaven.

Can the path by which this common theme spread be traced, that is can the filiation between the versions be established? This question is of some importance. If it could be established that the Phoenicians were the intermediaries through whom the Greeks learned the mythological theme, Philo's theory would be—to some extent—confirmed, albeit in a sense he never intended.

Güterbock has argued that the Phoenicians were the intermediaries through whom the Greeks learned the story.[144] Philo and Hesiod, Güterbock maintains, both have gods who are abstractions.[145] Philo and the Kumarbi stories share the list of four divine rulers. Philo's sources Güterbock concludes, were the means through which the Hittite stories reached Greece. This interchange would have taken place at Ras Shamra or at some similar place where the peoples came into contact during the second millennium B.C.

Güterbock's conclusion, though shared by other scholars,[146] over-

---

puts it on himself (Tablet I, lines 60-69). Admittedly we may be guilty of overinterpretation here, but it does occur to us that the act of tearing off Apsu's tiara is comparable to an act of castration." See also above, n. 132.

[144] Güterbock, *Kumarbi*, pp. 114-115.

[145] E.g. Philo's Misor and Sydyk or Hesiod's Chaos, Eros, Themis, Mnemosyne etc. See also Dornseieff, "Altorientalisches in Hesiod," pp. 239-240.

[146] Hölscher, "Anaximander," pp. 392-393; Mras, "Sanchuniathon," p. 186; West, *Theogony*, pp. 28-30 regards this conclusion with more caution. The pan-orientalists go even farther than Hölscher and Mras. The. argue that Kronos of Greek myth is virtually entirely a Phoenician import—so Dornseieff, "Altorientalisches in Hesiod," pp. 242-246, or that the entire Kingship in Heaven theme may be of Phoenician origin—so Dussaud, "Theogonie," pp. 230-231. Astour, *HS*, pp. 217-218 makes few specific comments on Hesiod's *Theogony*, restricting his detailed remarks to the *Works and Days*. He does note that Güterbock's thesis is supported by his own proof of the Phoenician origin of much in Boeotian myth, and reminds the reader that Hesiod came from Boeotia. Since I find Güterbock's more restrained conclusion unlikely (see below), I cannot accept the more extreme conclusions of Dornseieff and Dussaud. For a critical review of Astour's "proofs" see Muhly, "Astour," p. 586.

looks much that separates the three accounts, as was shown above. None of the versions possesses the aspects necessary for identification as the intermediary between the other ones. Steiner, another student of the problem, has accordingly proposed a much more complex explanation of the relationships. He suggests that "the Enuma Elish was the immediate source of two intermediate albeit unattested versions labeled 'X' and 'Y.'[147] The 'Y' version ... ultimately reached Greece and manifested itself in Hesiod's *Theogony*. The Hurrian-Hittite version reflects both the 'X' and the 'Y' versions, although the former would seem to be the most immediate source ... The 'X' version perhaps also gave rise to a third unattested version, 'Z', which together with the Hesiodic version is reflected in Philo's History."[148] What is significant for our purposes in Steiner's analysis is that Philo's story is *not* the intermediary through which the motif reached Greece. Also significant is Steiner's conclusion that Philo's version was based on Hesiod.[149] If this is correct Philo's contention is not even confirmed in the indirect sense we have been considering.

Perhaps the most prudent approach is that taken by West and Barnett. Two versions of the "Kingship on Heaven" theme—the Hittite and Phoenician—are only imperfectly known, a crucial section of the former preserved only on a badly broken text and the latter preserved only in outline. Given these facts and the numerous differences between the versions as we know them, any filiation or conclusive proof of how the theme reached Greece is difficult if not impossible.[150] West very tentatively suggests Ugarit as the point of contact, Barnett Cilicia.[151] Perhaps then, according to West, Philo was correct in a way, but in our current state of knowledge this conclusion is close to conjecture.

One question remains. Philo, in claiming that his story was Hesiod's source is also asserting that his story antedates Hesiod. Is this claim correct? Is the story as told by Philo a relic of the pre-eighth century somehow accurately preserved by Philo? Steiner thinks Philo's version has been touched up to look more like Hesiod,[152] Philo's story thus seems to have been based on versions of the myths known in the temples of his time; in that sense Philo's stories do not antedate Hesiod. When one recognizes the changes which Philo imposed on the material, such as turning a theogonic account of the wars of Ouranos, Ge, and Kronos into a story of war between mortals,[153] one sees that the versions Philo tells definitely do not antedate Hesiod. Earlier versions of these stories had certainly been told in Byblos during the second millennium. Perhaps these myths were somehow associated with the venerable name of Sanchuniathon, but Philo knew the contemporary or near contemporary versions, and rewrote these to suit his own theories.

---

[147] The Babylonian origin of the basic theme is accepted by Littleton, "Kingship in Heaven," pp. 396-400 and other scholars.

[148] Steiner, *Sukzessionsmythos*, p. 104. Similarly, Troiani, p. 180.

[149] See the commentary on 811: 15 and above p. 236.

[150] West, *Theogony*, p. 30. Cf. Schwabl, "Griechischen Theogonien," p. 44.

[151] Barnett, "Walcot," p. 152.

What Philo has done, and how he utilized his sources, is clear in the light of the discussion above. He knew a more or less contemporary Byblian version of the "Kingship in Heaven" theme. He exploited the similarities between the version he knew and Hesiod in order to make the claim that Hesiod learned all from the Phoenicians. Philo's *History* is an example of the anti-Greek theories typical of his age.

813 : 23-25 ταῦτα-μαρτυρίας

The significance of this appeal to Porphyry has been discussed above, Chapter Four, pp. 53-54.

iv

In the course of the commentary on the fragments a number of comparisons have been made between Philo and the other Euhemeristic historians. It seems useful to collect these agreements and present them in tabular form.

---

[152] See note 148.

[153] That the original version of the story was theogonic is assured by the names of the actors and by the other Kingship in Heaven myths. See above, p. 212, and Schwabl, "Griechischen Theogonien," pp. 44-45.

	Euhemerus FGrH 63	D. Skyt. FGrH 32	Philo of Byblos
Secret source	2, 4-5		805: 8-10
In Hieroglyphs	3,46,8		805: 10
First Humans were Vegetarians		7,56,3	807: 21
Sky and/or Earth Share Name with Mortal; Name Change	2,6	7,56,5 7,57,2	809: 15
Kronos & Atlas were Brothers Cf. Hesiod, *Th.* 507ff.	14-15 (?)	7,60,1 7,61,1	809: 22-23
Ouranos had Many Wives Cf. Hesiod, *Th.* 154		7,57,1	809: 23-25
Rebellion in Heaven	14		810: 14-16
Group named after Leader	14-15 (Titans)	7,57,1 (Titans) 7,60,4 (Atlantides)	810: 18-19 (Elohim)
Hermes recorded History	3,46,8		812: 29-813: 3

The number and extent of these agreements becomes particularly significant when one remembers that all three authors are preserved only in sparse fragments. Although relatively little of each of their works has survived, they share these small details. The Euhemeristic school thus apparently had certain commonplaces or canons of historiography, which Philo shared.[154]

---

[154] Brown, "Euhemerus," pp. 267-274 (and many other modern scholars, see p. 92, n. 94) did not notice these minor agreements between Euhemerus, Dionysios Skytobrachion, and Philo. Brown did not realize the extent to which Philo's work was thoroughly Euhemerized.
I find these specific comparisons between Philo and the other Euhemerists much more telling than the general comparisons proposed by Oden, "Philo of Byblos," pp. 118-125.

CHAPTER TEN

CHILD SACRIFICE & SNAKES

i

The fragments to be discussed in this chapter deal with child sacrifice and with snakes. These passages have, on the whole, less interested all commentators on Philo and accordingly have not been intensively discussed. The lack of interest is readily explicable: these fragments are not directly related to the central questions of the scholarly debate concerning Philo and his sources. Nonetheless, they have some interest.

ii

Translation of Texts Discussed

(Porphyry)

(813: 26) The Phoenicians, too, in great disasters, whether of wars, or droughts, or plagues, used to sacrifice one of their dearest, dedicating him to Kronos. (813: 28) And the *Phoenician History*, which Sanchuniathon wrote in Phoenician and which Philo of Byblos translated into Greek in eight books, is full of such sacrificers.

(Eusebius)

(814: 3) Accordingly let these [quotations] from the aforementioned work suffice.[1] But from the first book of Philo's *Phoenician History* I shall cite the following:

(Philo)

(814: 6) It was the custom of the ancients, when great dangers befell [them], that, to avoid complete destruction, the rulers of the city or the people should give over to slaughter the most beloved of their children as a ransom to the vengeful daimons. And those given over were slain with mystic[2] rites. (814: 10) Now Kronos—whom the Phoenicians call El and who ruled the land and later, after the end of his life was deified in the star of Kronos—had, by a native nymph called Anobret, an only son who was therefore called Ieoud (for an only son is thus called even now by the Phoenicians). (814: 15) When on account of war, the greatest dangers seized the land, he adorned his son as if he were king and, having prepared an altar, sacrificed him.

---

[1] As Jacoby notes, the aforementioned work is Porphyry's *De Abstinentia*.

(Eusebius)

(814: 18) Observe what the same author again (translating "On the Phoenician Elements" from Sanchuniathon's work) says concerning creeping and venomous animals which serve no good end for men but work death and destruction to those in whom they inject their dangerous and painful poison. And he indeed writes, word for word, the following things, saying thus:

(Philo)

(814: 23) The nature therefore of the snake and of serpents, Taautos himself regarded as divine, and after him, again, the Phoenicians and Egyptians [did so]. For he presented the animal as that of all the reptiles which contained most spirit and as being [of the nature] of fire. (814: 26) Besides which he also attributes to it unsurpassable swiftness on account of the spirit, since it lacks feet and arms or any other of the outer limbs by means of which the other animals move. (815: 1) And it makes the forms of various figures, and when it moves it advances with spiral motions at whatever speed it desires. (815: 3) And it is most long-lived, for it not only sheds its old skin and becomes young but also it is increased [by the process] and becomes bigger. (815: 5) And when it has filled out the established measure [of age] it consumes itself, just as Taautos himself described in the sacred writings. (815: 7) Therefore, too, this animal is taken into the temples and mysteries. (815: 8) It has been discussed by us more fully in the treatises entitled Ethothion, in which it is established that the snake is immortal and that it is resolved into itself as was said above. (815: 11)

---

[2] The choice between "mystic" and "secret" as renderings of μυστικῶς is discussed in the commentary *ad loc.*

For the nature of this animal is such that it does not die unless it is struck by some violent force. (815 : 12) The Phoenicians call it Agathos Daimon. Similarly the Egyptians name it Kneph. (815: 14) They attribute to it the head of a falcon on account of the falcon's activity. (815: 15) And Epeeis (who was named by them as the greatest hierophant and sacred scribe and whom Areios of Herakleopolis translated into Greek) allegorizes as follows word for word:

(Epeeis *ap.* Philo)

(815: 18) The first and holiest being is the serpent which has the form of a falcon and is very pleasing. If it looked forth everything in its birthplace was filled with light. And if it shut its eyes there was darkness.

(Philo)

[Thus] Epeeis, giving the impression that it is also fiery, because he says, "it shone through," for shining through is peculiar to light. (815: 22) And Pherekydes, too, taking his beginnings from Phoenicians also theologized concerning the god he called Ophioneus and concerning the Ophionides of whom we shall speak later. (815: 25) Moreover the Egyptians, from the same notion, when drawing the world engrave as the circumference an airy and fiery circle and stretched out in the middle a snake in the form of a falcon. (815: 28) The whole figure looks like our [Greek] Theta. (815: 29) Declaring the circle to be the cosmos, [they say] the snake in the middle is Agathos Daimon the connective [bond] of this [cosmos]. (815: 30) And the Magus Zoroaster in the *Sacred Collection of the Persian* [*Records*] says, word for word:

(Zoroaster *ap.* Philo)

(816: 1) And the god has a falcon's head. This is the first god, incorruptible, everlasting, unborn, indivisible, most uncomparable, the controller of all good, unbribable, the best of good things, and the wisest of the wise. He is the father of good order and justice, self-taught, natural and perfect and wise and the sole discoverer of sacred nature.

(Philo)

(816: 6) Ostanes says the same things about him in the [book entitled]

Octateuch. (816: 7) All [these writers] taking their beginnings from Taautos gave [serpents] physical interpretations as was stated above. (816: 9) And having built temples, they consecrated in the *adyta* those first elements which the serpents represented and for these they celebrated festivals and offered sacrifices and performed secret rites, since they thought them the greatest gods and the rulers of all things. (816: 12) This is what [Taautos says] concerning snakes.

(Eusebius)

(816: 13) Accordingly, then, the content of Phoenician theology is of this sort, of which the saving word preaches that ... we should flee it without turning back. And inasmuch as these things happen not to be myths and poet's fictions which contain some theory concealed in hints, but rather true testimonies, (as they [too] would say) of wise and ancient theologians which contain things older than all the poets and historians, (816: 18) and which bring proof for their statements from the terminology and history of the gods which down until now prevails in the cities and villages of Phoenicia, and from the mysteries which are celebrated in each [of these cities and villages], (816: 20) it should be clear that one should not seek out violent physical interpretations of these things since the facts themselves provide clear refutation [of such interpretations]. Such then, is the theology of the Phoenicians.

iii

813: 26-814: 3 Φοινίκες-ἥρμήνευσεν

Child sacrifice has already been discussed in the previous chapter (*ad* 812: 6-7). This quotation from Porphyry adds several points not mentioned in that passage. Kronos' sacrifice of his son was offered at a time of pestilence and destruction (812: 6). We now learn that such sacrifices were offered at other times of crisis, such as wars or droughts, in addition to plagues (813: 27).[3] A second fact added in this fragment is that the infants were offered to Kronos. The description of the child as τῶν φιλτάτων τινὰ, "one of the most beloved," agrees with μονογενῆ υἱὸν, "a beloved son," of 812: 6.[4]

---

[3] Weinfeld, "Moloch and the Queen of Heaven," pp. 133-135.

[4] See Commentary on 812: 6.

All aspects of Philo's description are confirmed by other sources. 2 Kings 3: 21-27 speaks of the offering by Mesha of Moab at a time of military crisis. Diodorus Siculus' description of child sacrifice at Carthage (20,14,4-6) agrees with Philo, as does Tertullian (*Apol.* 9,2). It should, however, be noted that none of the significant confirmatory evidence is of Phoenician provenance.[5] Indeed, Quintus Curtius Rufus (IV,III,15,23) aside, Philo is the only witness to the practice among Phoenicians. Nevertheless, the veracity and accuracy of the practices described by Philo are assured by the fact that the Punic rites can only be explained as part of their Phoenician heritage.[6]

Tertullian writes that child sacrifice continued in North Africa down to the days of the Roman Empire; it is unlikely that it continued that long in Phoenicia. As we do not know where Philo lived or traveled (see above p. 35 n. 14), it is not absolutely certain that Philo never witnessed a child sacrifice. Nevertheless, it is highly unlikely, and Philo's source(s) must derive from Phoenician tradition.

Child sacrifice, as described by Philo, was practiced by Phoenicians, but this sacrifice—offered, according to Philo, only in response to fairly specific and infrequent crises—must have been relatively rare. On the basis of Philo's testimony, Weinfeld concludes that child sacrifice was not a "fixed institution." This, for Weinfeld, is a first significant difference between Philo's sacrifices and the Biblical Moloch cult: the latter was a "fixed institution" since it had temples and priests.[7] Morton Smith has argued against Weinfeld that if Tertullian may be believed (*Apol.* 9,2 cited above, p. 50) child sacrifice in Africa was also practiced at temples served by priests.[8] In that sense, therefore, while child sacrifice would have been an infrequent rite (and while the temples must have had other functions and the priests other duties), it would nevertheless have been a part of a "fixed institution."

More important than this debate is the fundamental question raised by Weinfeld about the nature of the Moloch cult: was it one in which children were sacrificed or were they dedicated? Philo offers little help for answering this difficult and disputed question.[9] One reason Philo is of such little help has not been noted. Philo tells of a child offered by Kronos to his father Ouranos (812: 6-7). Kronos also sacrificed a son to the "vengeful diamons," apparently some sort of chthonic deities (814: 9). Philo also notes that children were offered to Kronos (813: 29); Tertullian (*Apol.* 9,2) and Diodorus Siculus (20, 14,4-6) confirm this fact for Punic Africa. Child sacrifice was thus not limited to the cult of one god. Comparisons between this group of cults and the Moloch cult must be undertaken with caution. Caution is particularly essential if Weinfeld is correct and if Moloch is Baal = Hadad,[10] and yet another deity must be introduced into the picture.

---

[5] Even the archaeological evidence usually cited (e.g., DeVaux, *Studies*, pp. 81-84) is of Punic provenance.

[6] DeVaux, *Studies*, p. 84. Weinfeld, "Moloch and the Queen of Heaven," p. 133, n. 2 distorts DeVaux slightly by only quoting a passage from *Studies*, p. 87.

[7] Weinfeld, "Moloch and the Queen of Heaven," p. 133.

[8] Smith, "Burning Babies," p. 477.

814:3-17 ταῦτα-κατέθυσεν

Before turning to detailed comments on this passage one problem must be considered. Eusebius cites this passage twice: once in Book Four of the *P.E.* as coming from Philo's *Phoenician History* (814: 3-17), and once in Book One as from Philo's Περὶ Ἰουδαίων (818: 16). Was the latter a separate work of Philo's or was it a section of the *Phoenician History*? Origen refers to it as if it were an independent work (817: 28-818: 6) and this it probably was. Eusebius either got the reference wrong in one passage or the other, or else Philo cited one of his works in the other. On the latter hypothesis, we don't know the order in which Philo wrote his works, hence cannot be certain for which book the passage might have originally been written. The contents of the passage, focusing on Kronos (who, as we have seen, has an important role in Book One of the *Phoenician History*), suggest that if we are to explain Eusebius' conflicting references as citation by Philo of one work in another, it is probable that this passage was written for the *Phoenician History*, and then cited by Philo in his work on the Jews.

The idea that Philo wrote this passage on child sacrifice for the *Phoenician History* and then cited it in his work on the Jews is also plausible.[11] "Quarrelsome critics," long before Philo of Byblos, had unfavorably compared the binding of Issac with stories of child sacrifice from other ancient cultures.[12] Philo of Byblos, an opponent of the Jews, could well have done the same with Phoenician examples. In writing against the Jews, the Phoenician materials lay at hand in Book One of his *Phoenician History.* Hence he quoted from the *Phoenician History* in his Περὶ Ἰουδαίων.[13]

---

[9] Teixidor, "BES 1974," #64, p. 311. See also Weinfeld, "Burning Babies," pp. 411-413 in which Weinfeld replies to the objections raised by several critics of his "Moloch and the Queen of Heaven."

[10] Smith, "Burning Babies," p. 477. Cf. Teixidor, "BES 1974," #64, pp. 312-313, esp. p. 313.

814: 6-9 ἔθος-δαίμοσι

The circumstances calling for child sacrifice are described here as "dangers," thus agreeing with the fuller list of 813: 27 and with Phoenician practice.[14] The victim, as was noted above on 812: 6, is the most beloved son, τὸ ἠγαπημένον τῶν τέκνων: ἀγαπητός and μονογενῆς are often used synonymously,[15] while Hebrew יחיד can mean both "only" and "beloved."[16]

One further important detail is added in this passage. Child sacrifice was not performed by all Phoenicians, and was not a substitute for exposure. Only aristocratic families, it seems, were required or expected to perform this rite.[17] With this conclusion the evidence of Philo agrees, specifying that τοὺς καρτοῦντας ἢ πόλεως ἢ ἔθνους sacrificed their sons.

814: 9-10 κατεσφάττοντο-μυστικῶς

Μυστικῶς can mean that the children were sacrificed "mystically," or "secretly." I have chosen the former as the rite described in 814: 16-17 seems to have been public, not secret, but might be called "mystic," —i.e. symbolic—as the boy was dressed up to look like the king.

---

[11] Cf. Gruppe, p. 365. I should also note that Philo refers to his other books, e.g. the Παραδόξος Ἱστορία in the *Phoenician History* (805: 20). This raises the probability of citations of one work in another.

[12] Philo Judaeus, *De Abr.* 178-183. Philo Judaeus felt it necessary to offer a long defence of Abraham, *De Abr.* 184-200. He clearly must have felt the power of the unfavorable comparison.

[13] This is the explanation adopted by Clemen, pp. 2-3.

[14] See note 3.

[15] See the commentary on 812: 6.

[16] "Only" is, of course, the usual meaning. See BDB s.v. יחיד, p. 402. "Beloved" may be the sense intended in Prov. 4: 3.

[17] See note 3.

814: 10-17 Κρόνος-κατέθυσεν

After the generalities on child sacrifice, one case is cited. Kronos = El offered his son Ieoud at a time of war.

The passage is quite specific as to the time in Kronos' "life" when the sacrifice took place. Kronos already "rules the land," that is he has already replaced Ouranos as king. We have seen above that there was a thirty-two year lapse between Kronos' acquisition of the kingship and the castration of Ouranos,[18] but Philo does not specify whether the sacrifice was before or after the latter event. The sacrifice of 812: 6-7 is specifically placed after the castration of Ouranos. Moreover, the sacrifice of 812: 6-7 was at a time of pestilence while that of 814 was at a time of war. Therefore, these were probably two different sacrifices. Philo's *Phoenician History* was not only full of the names of sacrificers (813: 28-814: 1) but one such sacrificer seems to have performed the rite twice. Perhaps Philo has combined accounts from two sources on Kronos' sacrifice of his son.[19] or perhaps one source contained stories of several sacrifices.

Kronos' sacrifice in wartime also deserves comment. Who was the enemy? Possibly Ouranos, but possibly some other mythological figure. This passes conjecture.

Two semitic names appear in this passage, the nymph Anobret and Ieoud. Anobret, the mother of the victim, is otherwise totally unknown and the explanations of her name are unconvincing.[20] Ieoud is a problem of a different sort. MS. D. reads Ieoud, while MS. A reads Iedoud, translations of יחיד and ידיד respectively. As Ieoud = יחיד is literally translated by μονογενῆς (814: 13 & 14), it is preferable.[21]

That the boy was dressed up as if he were king for the sacrifice indicates that this was a rite of substitution—the boy dying instead of the king.[22] The same sense is doutless to be understood in 812: 6-7 where the child is offered to Ouranos, most probably as atonement.

---

[18] See Chapter Eight, p. 194 & 211.

[19] This would not be the first time Philo would be suspected of combining sources. See above, p. 235, n. 120.

[20] See Williams, pp. 190-191.

[21] Eissfeldt, *S. von B.*, p. 19, n. 3; "Textkritische Bemerkungen," p. 97. See also Gen. 22: 12, 16 and Jud. 11: 34.

That Kronos, "after the end of his life was deified in(to) the star of Kronos" (814: 11-12),[23] need not imply that Kronos was "translated" into the star; I would rather take it as another specific example of the practice ascribed to the most ancient people in 806: 6, that of giving the names of kings to the cosmic elements.[24]

iv

The section which follows, 814: 18-816: 12, is quite different from the other fragments. Its main subject is not "mortals," their deeds or inventions, but snakes. Eusebius, I believe, quoted this passage as a final argument for the foolishness of paganism. Eusebius and his readers think snakes are dangerous and noxious (814: 20-22). But, Eusebius argues, look at the foolish pagans who consider snakes divine. How ridiculous![25]

814: 18-22 ὁ δ' αὐτὸς-λέγων

Eusebius says the following quotation comes from the same author, i.e. Philo, translating Sanchuniathon's περὶ τῶν Φοινίκων στοιχείων. Leaving aside for the moment the question of what Φοινίκων στοιχείων means, is the entire phrase the title of a book (or chapter within a book), or is it simply Sanchuniathon's discussion of these questions? The choice is quite difficult, but Eusebius' wording suggests that the phrase is a title.[26] If a title, it is highly unlikely that is the title of some "other" work by Sanchuniathon also translated by Philo. Philo, as we have noted, claimed to be translating τὴν πᾶσαν τοῦ Σαγχουνιάθωνος "Sanchuniathon's entire work (804: 19-20)," in his *Phoenician History*.

---

[22] For different interpretations of the significance of the royal costume compare Albright, *YGC*, pp. 240-242, and Weinfeld, "Moloch and the Queen of Heaven," pp. 133-134, esp. p. 134, n. 7.

[23] Kronos' star is the planet Saturn on which see Bouche-Leclerq, *Astrologie Grecque*, pp. 93-97.

[24] The other example of this supposed practice would be the giving of the names of Ouranos and Ge to the sky and earth, 809: 15ff.

[25] Williams, p. 192 realized that this was the reason Eusebius cited the section on snakes. See also Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, p. 35.

[26] Williams, p. 120 is one of the scholars who does not take the phrase as a title.

Since the section on the Φοινίκων στοιχείων is explicitly identified as coming from Philo's translations of Sanchuniathon, it must have been a part of the *Phoenician History*, a chapter heading or section of that work.[27] As we shall see, there is much in the quotation to confirm this conclusion; the passage has many connections with ideas developed in the other fragments of the *Phoenician History*.

The title of the section, Φοινίκων στοιχείων, has been variously translated. Philo uses the word στοιχεῖα in two senses in the fragments: it means "letters" in 809: 9 and 812: 17, and "elements" in 806: 9 and 816: 9. Given these attested usages it is not surprising that the title of the section has been rendered by some as "Phoenician Alphabet," by others as "Phoenician Elements."[28] Since στοιχεῖα at the end of our passage, in 816: 9, means "elements" it is most probable that it also means "elements" in the title of the section from which our passage was excerpted. Moreover, if στοιχεῖα means "letters" there is little in the passage to justify that supposed title. The snakes make various figures while moving (815: 1), and an Egyptian figure is like a Greek Theta (815: 28), but these are asides, too incidental and trivial to have been the focal point of the original section. The passage ends, however, with the mention that for some, snakes represented the elements (816: 9). In that sense therefore an account of the "Phoenician Elements" (or perhaps better, "The Elements according to the Phoenicians") would properly consider snakes. For these reasons I have rendered the title of the section as "On the Phoenician Elements."[29]

In order to understand the quotations from Philo which follow, one additional fact is crucial. Philo claimed to have done much reading in preparing his *History* (805: 17-18) and he often discussed the opinions of his opponents at great length (807: 26-808: 2). The fragments discussed thus far hardly attest either extensive reading or long discussion of opposing viewpoints. The interpretations and theories accepted by Philo dominate almost totally. I believe that the fragment to be discussed can be properly understood only when one realizes that here the views of opponents are presented and criticized.[30]

---

[27] See Eissfeldt, "Art and Aufbau," pp. 94-95; Cf. Clemen, p. 3.

[28] The first to render the title as "Phoenician Elements," was Orelli, p. 45, followed by Ewald, p. 65. Clemen, p. 3, Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, p. 34, and Williams, p. 120 prefer this translation. The translation "Phoenician Alphabet" was adopted by Movers, p. 117; Lobeck, pp. 1339-1341; Renan, p. 282.

[29] It should be added, however, that the two translations may both be correct. The Greek numbers were letters, and for some, particularly Pythagoreans, numbers were the basic elements of things. A treatise on the alphabet might also be a treatise on the elements of the world.

814: 23-25 τῆν-Αιγύπτιοι

Taautos considered the snake divine. Since Taautos is Sanchuniathon's and hence Philo's supposed authority (804: 22-805: 1), Philo must agree with this divinization. On what grounds? In the introduction to the *Phoenician History* Philo argued that the most ancient peoples accepted only two types of gods : mortal and immortal, that is deified mortals and immortal aspects of nature (806: 9-10). The latter category consisted of the sun, moon, planets, elements, and "things connected with these," τὰ τούτοις συναφῆ (806 : 7-9). Snakes I suggest, are also considered divine as one of τὰ τούτοις συναφῆ. The purpose of 814: 25-815: 15 is to explain the nature of the snake and demonstrate why it qualifies as an immortal god in Philo's system.[31] If this interpretation is correct, it is clear why Philo discussed snakes in the section devoted to the Phoenician elements.

814: 25-26 πνευματικώτατον-παρεδόθη

The snake is described in physical, perhaps Stoic,[32] terms as containing most spirit (*pneuma*) and fire. The description may be incorrect, but is not supernatural.

814 : 26-815 : 2 παρ' ὅ-τάχος

Other ancient authors, e.g. Aristotle and Aelian, knew that snakes moved by crawling.[33] Philo asserts that snakes move by means of the

---

[30] Gruppe, pp. 369-370 believed these fragments came not from Philo's pen, but from the works of some allegorizing author. Lagrange, pp. 369-370 followed Gruppe. Jacoby inclined to Gruppe's opinion and labeled the fragment dubious. This opinion is based on the fact that there are many allegorical and physiological interpretations of snakes in these lines. The detailed analysis of these fragments will show that Gruppe was partially correct—allegorical and physiological interpretations are offered, but are cited by Philo as part of his criticisms of opponents. Cf. Barr, "Philo of Byblos," pp. 30-31.

[31] For a similar argument see Eissfeldt, *T. und S.*, p. 34. Cf. Williams, p. 196.

[32] See SVF, Vol. 2, frags. 715-716.

[33] Aristotle, *MA*, 9; Aelian *NA* 6, 18. See also Gen. 3: 14.

pneuma. I believe Philo intended to suggest some sort of jet propulsion.[34] This is, of course, incorrect, but again natural. One further possibility should be considered. There was one snake, the *iaculum* = ἀκοντίας, which the ancients said moved so fast it almost flew. This snake could attack from trees, flew like a javelin, and was accordingly named.[35] Herpetologists believe the ancient authors were discussing the *Zamenis Gemonensis Laur.*, a snake prevalent in Italy and Greece.[36] Perhaps Philo's description was inspired by this snake. Whatever the case, jet propulsion was discovered in Alexandria[37] and the *iaculum* is not a Near Eastern snake. Philo's account of the locomotion of snakes seems therefore derived from Greek science. The nature of his sources must be determined accordingly.[38]

815: 3-5 καὶ πολυχρονιώτατον-πέφυκε

After the snakes' unusual means of locomotion their most remarkable characteristic is the annual shedding of their skin. Philo, like many other ancients, understands this as a process of rejuvenation.[39]

815: 5-7 καὶ ἐπειδὰν-γραφαῖς

Given the annual rejuvenation, snakes only leave the earth when they consume themselves after having grown to the predetermined size (or, lived the fated number of years). Taautos discussed this in his sacred writings.

815: 7-8 διὸ καὶ-συμπαρείληπται

This sentence is an aside, directed against Philo's opponents : because of these characteristics the snake is taken a sacred animal in temples and mysteries.[40] The mention of *mysteries* is the sign of disapproval on Philo's part, as Philo consistently opposes mysteries and mysterymakers (See 805: 4-8; 813: 3-7).

---

[34] I am embarassed to admit that the only author to have supposed this is Charroux, *Maîtres du Monde*, p. 57.

[35] Aelian *NA*, 6, 18; Pliny *NH*, 6,85.

[36] See Gossen-Steier, "Schlange (Arten)," cols. 522-523.

[37] See Clagett, *Greek Science*, p. 101.

[38] Cf. Chapter Six, pp. 121-124.

[39] See Keller, *Antike Tierwelt*, Vol. 2, p. 289.

[40] An example of such use of a snake would be that described in Lucian's *Alexander*. See also Hinnells, "Reflections," pp. 293-298.

815: 8-12 εἴρηται-ζῷον

The snake is immortal, consumes itself,[41] and does not die unless it is violently killed. This supposed fact is crucial as it qualifies the snake as divine in Philo's theological scheme. It was therefore properly divinized by Taautos (814: 24).

Philo's treatises Ἐθωθιῶν, where one can read more on these subjects, are an enigma. Renan's suggestion, that Ἐθωθιῶν = אותיות or, *A Treatise on the Alphabet*,[42] is not decisive if one holds that the excerpt from Philo comes from a section on the elements, not the alphabet.[43] Gutschmid and Eissfeldt have proposed that the proper reading is Θωθείων, that is, *Commentaries on the Teachings and Writings of Taautos*. Eissfeldt notes that this interpretation is supported by Suidas' attribution to Sanchuniathon of a book entitled περὶ τῆς Ἑρμοῦ φυσιολογίας, *On the Physical Doctrines of Hermes*.[44] But this is unlikely, as Philo consistently employs Taautos (Thoth is used only for purposes of identification), and the title of the treatise should be Ταυτείων or something of the sort. Moreover, the reference in Suidas may not be independent but based on Philo's ascription of everything in the *Phoenician History* to Taautos = Thoth.[45] It is therefore most prudent to concede ignorance and to suggest that the title of the work was so strange that it has become irretrievably garbled.

815: 12-15 Φοίνικες-ἱέρακος

In previous fragments Philo has assigned a position of honor to the Egyptians. They and the Phoenicians were two of the most ancient peoples who worshipped their gods similarly (805 : 25-26). The Egyptians, unlike the Greeks, are not a nation that copied and borrowed the treasures of others, but are among the originators (805: 26-27). Of course, though, the Phoenicians take precedence. Civilization began in Phoenicia before Kronos assigned Egypt to Thoth (812: 27-29).

---

[41] This alludes to the snake with its tail in its mouth, a familiar image. See Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, 1, 9, 12.

[42] Renan, p. 282.

[43] If the argument in n. 29 is correct Renan might still be right.

[44] Gutschmid, *KS*, Vol. 2, pp. 20-29; Eissfeldt, "Art und Aufbau," p. 96; "Textkritische Bemerkungen," p. 98.

[45] See 804: 22-25.

Accordingly here the Phoenicians come first in the worship of these divine beings. Philo says they call this god Agathodaimon, thus making them the founders of a cult originally Greek but in Philo's time long popular all around the Mediterranean and perhaps especially so in Alexandria.[46] The equation with Kneph is correct.[47]

The hawk headed snake is a problem. A Hermetic prayer to Agathodaimon speaks of it as a bird and as a snake.[48] Representations of this figure, however, are harder to find. Cook cites a medal showing Nero as νέος Ἀγαθὸς Δαίμων, on the reverse of which a bearded and crested snake appears.[49] But is this snake bird-headed or is it the usual representation of Agathodaimon = Chnum as a lion-headed serpent?[50] Perhaps Philo and the prayer represent some tradition, otherwise apparently unknown, in which Agathodaimon was bird-headed, or they may be misinterpretations of the lion's head.

815: 15-17 καί φησιν-οὕτως

Epeeis and his supposed translator, Areios of Herakleopolis, are otherwise unknown. What is more significant is that they are Philo's opponents. Epeeis allegorizes and was the greatest hierophant, both sure signs of disapproval (See 805: 4-8; 813: 3-7). Accordingly, they must have misused the "facts" about snakes presented by Taautos.

815: 18-20 τὸ πρῶτον-ἐγίνετο

Williams notes that the ideas in this passage are similar to those in a Hermetic prayer to Agathodaimon.[51]

815: 20-22 ἔμφασιν-διαυγάσαι

This is Philo's comment on the quotation from Epeeis. Epeeis, like Taautos, realized the fiery nature of the serpent as his choice of words makes clear.

---

[46] On Agathodaimon see Nilsson, Vol. 2^2, pp. 213-219 and Visser, *Götter und Kulte*, pp. 5ff. Visser stresses the connections with Alexandria.

[47] For the equation of Kneph and Agathodaimon see Wilcken "Aegyptische Prophetie," p. 548.

[48] The prayer is in Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, pp. 28-29. Compare VII,2 and VII,8.

[49] Cook, *Zeus*, Vol. 2^2, p. 1128, fig. 956.

[50] See Delatte and Derchain, *Intailles*, pp. 54ff. Cf. Bidez-Cumont *Mages Hellenises*, p. 157, n. 1.

[51] Williams, p. 45. The prayer is the one cited above, n. 48.

815: 22-25 παρὰ Φοινίκων-λέξομεν

The charge that Pherekydes of Syros learned all from Phoenicians is repeated by Suidas. In his notice on Pherekydes, Suidas writes that he is said : ἑαυτὸν ἀσκῆσαι κτησάμενα τὰ Φοινίκων ἀπόκρυφα βιβλία, "to have trained himself, having acquired the secret books of the Phoenicians."[52] Neither statement need be worth much. Suidas may be dependent on Philo, and Philo may be at his usual game of claiming priority for the Phoenicians.[53]

As to the god Ophioneus and the Ophionides, Philo's further remarks have been omitted by Eusebius. We know from other sources that Pherekydes told of a war between Kronos and Ophioneus, who must have been some sort of snaky monster.[54]

815: 25-30 ἔτι μὴν-σημαίνοντες

Philo also disapproves of the symbolism of the cosmos in which a circle represents the world and the snake stretched out in the middle Agathodaimon, the connective bond of the cosmos. Philo would call this physiologizing (See 805: 6 and 813: 5-6).

Philo is not the only author to interpret the symbolism of the theta in a cosmic sense. A scholion on Dion. Thrac. reports a similar interpretation.[55] What is confusing in this passage is the emphasis on the Egyptian figure, as the Phoenicians seem to have had a different figure of their own. Macrobius reports that the Phoenicians represented the world by a snake devouring its own tail.[56] As a letter of the alphabet this figure would be an o, not a theta, and the snake is here the circumference. Why Philo chose to emphasize the Egyptian and not the Phoenician figure we do not know.

---

[52] DK 7 A 2.

[53] Walcot. *Hesiod*, pp. 18-22, maintains that analysis of the scanty remains of Pherekydes suggests that the charge made by Philo may be accurate. See also Clapham, p. 88. For a different conclusion see K & R, p. 68.

[54] For a discussion of Pherekydes' account of this battle see K & R, pp. 65-68.

[55] Schol. Dion. Thrac. p. 321,37 and 488 Hilgard : Θῆτα ὅτι τοῦ παντὸς θέσιν μιμεῖται· ἡ δὲ τοῦ παντὸς θέσις ἐστιν ὁ οὐρανός, ὅς τό τε κυκλοτερὲς ἔχει καὶ τὸν διὰ μέσου ἄξονα τῇ κατὰ μέσον χαρακτηρισθέντα μακρᾷ. I have not seen any representations of this theta-shaped figure.

[56] Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1,9,12. This figure is much like the Ophite diagram from Celsus. For an example of such a figure see Leisegang, *Gnosis*, plate opposite, p. 145.

815: 30-816: 6 καὶ Ζωροάστρης-εὑρετής

Zoroaster too is one of Philo's opponents, as is shown by 816: 7-8. The notions ascribed to Zoroaster are highly hellenized.[57]

816: 6-7 τὰ δ' αὐτὰ-'Οκτατεύχῳ

Ostanes, Zoroaster's pupil, expressed similar ideas.[58]

816: 7-9 πάντες-πρόκειται

This is Philo's parting shot at his enemies: they physiologized what they borrowed from Taautos. The charges of borrowing and physiologizing prove that Philo is accusing opponents.

816: 9-12 καὶ τὰ-ὄφεων

These opponents, as is appropriate for physiologizers, understood the snakes as representing the elements and accordingly consecrated the snakes in the *adyta* of temples,[59] offered sacrifices and performed secret rites (a final, sure sign that Philo is accusing opponents).

816: 13-22 ἀλλὰ γὰρ-θεολογία

These are Eusebius' final comments. Philo has been an excellent source for Eusebius' polemical purposes. He offers evidence certified by the practice of the Phoenicians. Moreover, his theories are clearly damaging to paganism and exclude any more favorable interpretation.

To conclude the analysis of the section on snakes, when one separates the theories of opponents from Philo's own theories it seems clear that the passage comes from the *Phoenician History*. The theories propounded in the introduction to that work are the key to the separation. Philo, in this section, attacks ideas about snakes popular in his day; the "physical" or "natural" description of the snakes (approved by Philo) seems a product of Greek science or pseudo-science. As in the case of the cosmogony, Philo's immediate sources must be dated sufficiently late to allow for this influence.

---

[57] See Bidez-Cumont, *Mages Hellenises*, Vol. 1, pp. 63, 101. Vol. 2, pp. 157-158.

[58] *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 173.

[59] Cf. the passage from Macrobius cited above, n. 56. See also n. 40.

V

The fragments of the *Phoenician History* discussed thus far all seem to come from the first book. There were, however, at least seven more books in the original work.[60] What was discussed in these books? Did Philo ever leave what we would call Phoenician mythology and discuss actual events or history. These questions cannot be answered, given the sparse fragments we possess from the remaining books (816: 24-817: 21). These fragments, however, all mention Philo's work in a mythological context (The Phoenician stories of Kronos, 816: 25-27, the vocalization of Nasibis, 817: 6, and the interpretation of Iao, 817: 17-18). They suggest that Philo never left mythology for actual history in his work.

If this is true, in what sense could Philo legitimately call his work the *Phoenician History*? The answer is apparent when one remembers Philo's persistent Euhemerism, which extends not only to the outline but, as we have seen, to the many small details of the work.[61] For a Euhemerist, all myth would be a proper topic of "history."[62]

---

[60] See Chapter Five, p. 67.

[61] See pp. 242-243 where Philo's work is discussed as conforming to the "canons" of Euhemeristic historiography.

[62] See p. 32, n. 4.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

CONCLUSIONS

i

The information we possess concerning the life and works of Philo of Byblos comes primarily from the entries in Suidas' *Lexicon*. The number and scope of the books attributed to Philo suggest that he must have been a learned man of broad competence. He must have read widely in order to write works such as *Concerning Cities and the Illustrious Men Each of them Produced* and *Concerning the Acquisition and Selection of Books*. Since the data in the entries in Suidas are contradictory and can be interpreted to support two different sets of dates, we cannot be certain when Philo lived. We can only be certain that he lived during the end of the first and at the beginning of the second centuries A.D.: he survived to write a book on Hadrian. We have no information about where Philo lived.

Porphyry and Eusebius (interestingly, not Suidas) both attribute to Philo a work entitled *The Phoenician History*, from which Eusebius, as part of his refutation of paganism in the first book of his *Praeparatio Evangelica* has preserved long extracts. These extracts are virtually the sole source of the *History*, as the work did not survive whole and did not much interest other authors. How Eusebius knew Philo's work has been the subject of some debate. While some believe that Eusebius copied the extracts from Porphyry's anti-Christian polemic, I have suggested that Eusebius probably knew the work independently. Whatever the source, Eusebius preserved Philo's text quite accurately, although there are several cases where we have proved that Eusebius consciously altered the context, sequence, or wording of the original in order to make Philo fit his purposes. Such polemical distortions are usually recognizable. Eusebius has, on the whole, preserved Philo well.

Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica* itself is generally well preserved. In one instance, however, we have a passage which presents serious difficulties in its current position in the MSS. of the *P.E.*, and have accordingly proposed moving that passage and reorganizing the text. Error, not intention, was responsible for the position of the passage in the MSS. The major fragments of Philo's *Phoenician History* therefore come from a well preserved author who took care to copy accurately (perhaps better, have accurately copied) the author he cited.

Philo's fragments are a source of great importance. The Ugaritic texts have taught us much about the mythology and religion accepted at Ugarit in the late Bronze Age, but we have no comparable sources for Phoenicia proper. Numerous Phoenician inscriptions have survived, but they are of the Iron Age. Furthermore, these inscriptions and the brief accounts in classical authors tell us little concerning the Phoenician gods, myths or religious practices. In our relative ignorance the fragments of Philo's *History* are a source of major significance: they are virtually the sole testimony to the myths and beliefs of the Phoenicians.

Both Porphyry and Eusebius state, and the fragments confirm, that Philo claimed his *History* was a translation of the work of Sanchuniathon, an ancient Phoenician. Both Porphyry and Philo date Sanchuniathon. While Porphyry places him before the Trojan War, Philo does not date him directly. Yet, when Philo maintains that Sanchuniathon's work passed to Greece and became Hesiod's source, this implies that Philo dated Sanchuniathon sometime prior to Hesiod. Sanchuniathon would thus have lived in the late second millennium B.C. or early in the first millennium. If Philo's claim to have translated Sanchuniathon were true and his date for Sanchuniathon accurate, the fragments would contain information on Phoenician religion and mythology from about 1000 B.C.

Philo's claims thus raise two problems: (1) what is the date of the source(s) of the material he has preserved; and (2) on the assumption that Sanchuniathon was a real person and somehow involved in the chain of transmission of Philo's material, when did he live? It seems best and simplest to treat these problems separately.

Philo's claim to have preserved intact material from ca. 1000 B.C. is seriously damaged by the obvious Euhemerism of the fragments. In the Introduction (805: 24-806: 10, with the possible addition of 807: 10-19), Philo outlines the principles of his interpretation of the religion of the ancients, principles all supposedly going back to his ancient source from ca. 1000 B.C. Philo asserts that the most ancient of the barbarians, particularly the Phoenicians and Egyptians, believed in only two categories of gods: deified culture heroes and the eternal objects of nature—the sun, moon, stars, elements, and things connected with them (including perhaps the winds and immortal snakes). This interpretation of religion agrees with Euhemerus', and Philo also consistently imposes Euhemeristic interpretations on his material. Thus he relates Phoenician mythology as if it were the history of the lives of various mortals deified for their contributions. His *Phoenician History*, in spite of the title, seems to have considered only mythological and not historical questions. Such Euhemerism cannot be ascribed to a Phoenician source from ca. 1000 B.C.

Few scholars would disagree with the conclusions of the preceding paragraph. Virtually all would agree that Philo reworked his source(s) at least slightly to make them fit his own pet Euhemeristic theories. Some recent scholars, however, have been insufficiently critical and treated Philo's Euhemerism as if it were a veneer which can be easily peeled away, and under which one can find sources from ca. 1000 B.C. perfectly preserved. I have tried to show that Philo's Euhemerism was extremely pervasive, extending to even very minor details of the work. Philo's *History* agrees on so many small points with the works of the other major Euhemeristic historians—Euhemerus himself, and Dionysios Skytobrachion—that I have written of Philo's work as conforming to the canons of Euhemeristic historiography. Thus, even if Philo had somehow discovered a text from ca. 1000 B.C., he would have thoroughly disfigured that text in the process of retelling it to conform with his own beliefs.

In addition, the problems posed by Philo's work are more complex than has hitherto been fully realized. Philo intended his work to be read as consecutive history (at least, that is the impression suggested by the fragments in Eusebius): first cosmogony, then zoogony, then anthropogony, followed by his account of the discoverers, and concluding with the wars of Kronos and the division of the world by his victorious party. Each section seemingly commences where the previous one has ended, the whole forming a single continuous narrative. I have argued, however, that the sections actually overlap: inventions are repeated in several sections and, more important, each of the major sections begins at the same point, with a cosmogony. Different cities of Phoenicia are prominent in the different sections. One section is in poetry, while the others are in prose. I have therefore concluded that each of the major sections comes from the mythology of the town prominent in that section, and that Philo has combined the traditions of at least two cities, Tyre and Byblos (together with a verse cosmogony of undeterminable provenance), in preparing his *History*. Thus, there is not one single source but many sources, and not one question about the date of this source but several, one for each of the major sections. (Why Philo attempted to give the impression of consecutive history is a question best deferred).

While the verse cosmogony is written in the same poetic technique as Biblical and Ugaritic poetry, comparison with the more abundant poetic remains of the Jews shows that the poetic form proves little about the nature and date of the contents. Analysis of the contents suggested that this text was based on ancient Phoenician traditions, but that these traditions had been demythologized and extensively reworked under the impact of Greek natural science. The verse cosmogony also seems very similar to the products of the neighbors of the Phoenicians during the first centuries A.D., a similarity which suggested that our text too may date from that period.

The discovery section also is not as old as some have claimed. The mention of Chousor, in particular, proves not the antiquity but the relatively recent origin of the material, since Philo's Chousor is an iron worker. The gap between Philo's information and that derived from the Ugaritic epics (where *kṯr wḫss* works gold and silver) is apparent if one looks critically.

In the wars of Kronos, Philo tells the Byblian version of the common Mediterranean myth of "Kingship in Heaven." Philo knows these Byblian myths not in their bronze-age forms, but in their classical or Hellenistic versions; they have been touched up to look more like Hesiod. Philo also exploits the similarities between the Byblian stories and Hesiod in order to charge Hesiod and the Greeks with error and untruth and to claim that the Phoenicians have the true and original account.

In summary, the recent discoveries from the Near East have not substantiated Philo's claims, although they have suggested new understandings of many difficult passages. Scholars who have claimed that these new discoveries have vindicated Philo and proven the antiquity of his material have been, in my opinion, overly impressed by what they suddenly understood and therefore, insufficiently critical. Philo does present Phoenician traditions: this is indisputable; but he has not somehow discovered and preserved unaltered some text(s) from hoary antiquity. Rather, he has claimed that the myths as told in his time, and as disfigured by his various theses, are the true ancient versions; they were in his time recent versions of ancient Phoenician traditions (somehow associated with the name of Sanchuniathon), not relatively unaltered bronze age or early iron age sources.

The results of this study may be clearer if restated in the context of the historiographical survey outlined in the first chapter: after the discovery of the Ugaritic texts, the first reaction of scholars was to conclude that the key to all the mysteries in Philo had been found. Recognition that not everything in Philo has a Ugaritic interpretation was grudging, and was not the major drive behind scholarly writing. In the past decade, reaction against the exaggerations inspired by the excitement of the discoveries at Ugarit has begun.

At this juncture, a full-scale commentary on Philo—more complete than Barr's article, and more attentive to both Near Eastern and Euhemeristic sources than Troiani—seemed essential. A thorough analysis of the fragments was necessary. The conclusions which emerge from the commentary in the preceding pages are a resounding vindication of the idea that Philo's fragments must be studied first and foremost as a product of the Greco-Roman world. While much in Philo can be explained in Ugaritic terms, much else is inexplicable in those terms. More passages are best understood in some non-Ugaritic context. That context varies: sometimes it is the world of Greek classical religion or of philosophical rationalism. Very often, Philo must be understood as a member of the Euhemeristic "school," or as a learned near easterner in the Greco-Roman culture.

An adequate explanation of the nature and date of Philo's sources must explain the fact that pieces of Philo's work fit into so many different contexts. The only explanation which meets this test is the one proposed above; Philo has taken what were, in his time, recent versions of ancient Phoenician traditions. In the process of presenting them, Philo has revised them to make them fit his own personal theories. Since Philo's sources were based on *ancient* traditions, sources such as Ugaritic myth explain certain aspects. Since, on the other hand, they were *recent* versions (and since the theories Philo imposed on his material were products of the Hellenistic world) we can understand why so much in Philo is best explained in Greek or Hellenistic terms.

ii

If these conclusions concerning the date of Philo's sources are correct, when then could Sanchuniathon have lived? The descriptions of Sanchuniathon by Philo, Porphyry, and Suidas prove that he must have been a venerable figure and authority of the Phoenician religion. As has been assumed throughout this study, Philo's sources must have been connected, somehow, with the venerable name of Sanchuniathon. Now, however, having seen the true nature of the material Philo ascribed to Sanchuniathon, and having seen the diversity and vast span of time covered by Philo's sources, it is clear that Sanchuniathon could have been a crucial figure anyplace, anywhere, and anytime during the long and complex history of the traditions Philo presents.

To put this conclusion a bit differently, other scholars (e.g. Albright, above, p. 49) have believed that dating Philo's material would help date Sanchuniathon. But Philo's sources now emerge as having been so numerous, and the history of these sources so complex that they seem of little help in suggesting a precise date for Sanchuniathon. There is nevertheless no reason to doubt the plausible assumption that a key figure would be earlier in the chain of tradition rather than later. Sanchuniathon would thus be a religious authority of Phoenician antiquity, perhaps even of the late second or early first millennium B.C.

Having reached this conclusion, two reminders are essential. First, the fact that Sanchuniathon may have lived ca, 1000 B.C. does not change the conclusion that the material ascribed to Sanchuniathon by Philo is of very diverse date, much of it postdating 1000 B.C. Furthermore, the reworking and reinterpretation of Phoenician traditions in the fragments has been so thorough that it is now impossible to isolate the "Sanchuniathon-strata." The conclusion that Sanchuniathon may have actually lived and worked ca. 1000 B.C., as Philo claims, is therefore far less significant than the conclusions reached concerning the nature and date of Philo's sources.

The second reminder is that, as I have shown, virtually all the data concerning Sanchuniathon preserved by Porphyry and Philo is derived from a Hellenistic milieu. Porphyry states that Hierombalos, Sanchuniathon's alleged source, dedicated his book to Abibalos of Beirut, but the practice of book dedication first became widespread in the Hellenistic period. Porphyry's date for Sanchuniathon, at the time of the Trojan War, reflects the concern of barbarian historians to prove their native sources older than Homer. Philo's description of Sanchuniathon's discovery in an *adyton* of the works of the *Ammouneōn* is an example of a *topos* commonly employed in later antiquity to give an air of antiquity and reliability to documents of recent origin. When Philo accuses the allegorizers, and especially the Greeks, of distorting and perverting the meaning of the original Phoenician sources, this too is a familiar trait of the "barbarian" historiography of the Hellenistic age. What little information we have concerning Sanchuniathon is most suspicious and of dubious historical value.

Sanchuniathon, in sum, remains a shadowy figure of antiquity. We know virtually nothing certain concerning the contents of his writings, and we have little or no reliable information about his life. The only figure we know with any certainty or clarity is Philo of Byblos.

iii

Why did Philo write the *Phoenician History*? Part of the answer, I believe, lies in Philo's attempt to make the overlapping sources read as if they were consecutive history. The Phoenician traditions of each city might seem as if they were a mass of confusing and contradictory stories. These myths would need systematization and organization in which the relative position of each god would be established. Homer and Hesiod had achieved similar results for the Greeks; perhaps Philo intended to do the same for the mythology of the Phoenicians. Arranging the parallel mythologies as if they were consecutive history would be a means of achieving this purpose.

Another reason Philo wrote his *History* was to express his intense Phoenician nationalism and anti-Greek bias. Philo claims that everything useful or important happened first or was discovered first by Phoenicians. He delights in contrasting the "true" Phoenician sources with the "derivative" and "deformed" versions current among the Greeks. The Greeks are not originators but imitators, and bad imitators at that.

Philo is not the only Phoenician—let alone, Near Easterner—to hold such views, but he is the best and fullest example. Some traces of similar attitudes can be found elsewhere, as in the belligerence of the Sidonian whom Pausanias met (above, p. 231). That Sidonian was argumentative, and asserted that the Phoenicians had much better notions about the gods than the Greeks. As Pausanias was Philo's younger contemporary, his Sidonian proves that Philo's attitude was not unique among Phoenicians of Philo's day. In addition to the passage in Pausanias there is the testimony of the coins. Several coin types became popular in Tyre during the third century A.D., a century or so after Philo. They show episodes from the life of Dido, or Kadmos teaching the Greeks to read and write (Hill, *BMC Phoenicia*, Tyre # 409 pl. XXXIII.6; # 488, pl. XXXV.1). The latter type, in particular, should be understood as expressing ideas similar to Philo's. "You Greeks," the coin type proclaims, "were illiterate until you learned to read and write from us!"

To conclude, the material preserved by Philo affords a valuable insight into the Phoenician religion as understood by one man of the early Roman empire. He has distorted the traditional material and presented it in a Euhemeristic and anti-Greek manner, but behind the distortions one can see traces of a more traditional mythology and religion.

The personal quality of Philo's work should be stressed. Philo could not accept the naive religion of popular piety (discussed by Teixidor, *The Pagan God*). His Euhemerism provided a "critical" account of the origins of religion which prevented him from finding popular practice and belief intellectually satisfying. Many of his contemporaries (e.g. Pausanias' Sidonian, and Plutarch) were finding new meaning in the ancient traditions through allegorical and physiological interpretations, but Philo believed these interpretations to be distortions. Philo's *History* is thus an intensely felt product of his age, and testimony to one man's interpretation of his native tradition in the light of contemporary thought.

INDEX OF NAMES*

Abel 210 n. 182
Abibalos 55, 56-58, 89, 91, 267
Abraham 187, 222
Agathodaimon 257
Agreus 165-166, 172
Agros 170-173, 178
Agrotes 170, 172-173
Aion 86, 88, 142, n. 5, 146-148, 158, 161, 177
Albright 43, 48-49, 50 n. 40, 54, 58, 71, 92 n. 94, 100-103, 107 n. 46, 107 n. 47, 118, 120, 137, 145 n. 12, 150, 154-155, 168 n. 151, 168 n. 153, 186, 193 n. 70, 203 n. 138, 204, 206 n. 154, 209 n. 173, 210, 211 n. 190, 252 n. 22, 266
Amanus 78, 154-155, 174
Ammon 79, 80
Amunos 173-174
Anat 95 n. 3, 189, 193, 194, 208, 221, 223, 230 n. 94
Anaximander 101, 109, 122
Anobret 251
Antioch 59
Antonius Pius 34
Anu 238
Aphrodite 200, 205, 211, 221
Apollo 39, 206, 231
Apollodorus 4
Apollonius 83
Apsu 110 n. 61, 110 n. 62, 113, 239
Areios of Herakleiopolis 257
Aristophanes 148 n. 36
Artemids = Titanids 204, 227
Arvad 57
Asherah 186 n. 27, 200
Asklepios. See also Eshmun. 177, 205, 227-231
Astarte 69, 144 n. 8, 195, 200-201, 204, 205, 219, 220-221
Astour 148 n. 34, 176 n. 204, 232 n. 107, 240 n. 146
Astronoe 230
Athena 39, 95 n. 3, 192-193, 194, 221
Athens 170, 221
Atlas 39, 190, 197-198, 243
Atthis 230 n. 96
Avishur 102 n. 26
Azael 164

Baal = Hadad 54, 72 n. 29, 72 n. 30, 106 n. 41, 117, 131-135, 137-139, 174, 184-185, 189, 192 n. 65, 193, 194, 195-197, 208, 210, 218-219, 223, 236, 237 n. 132
Baal Berit 186
Baal Hermon 154, 156
Baal *ḥmn* 78, 154-155, 173-174
Baal Lebanon 154
Baal Malage 171 n. 169
Baal *mgnn* 173-174
Baal Sadeh 171, 178
Baal *ṣpn* 153-154
Baal Tabor 155
Baalat Gebal = Dione 95 n. 3, 160 n. 113, 201, 205, 223
Baalbek 172
Baalshamem 95 n. 3, 149-151, 160 n. 113, 179, 185, 195 n. 83, 201, 220
Baalu 149 n. 41, 153, 169 n. 157, 171 n. 169, 202, 203 n. 133, 203 n. 138, 210, 219 n. 26, 229 n. 89, 231 n. 102
Baau 143-146, 158, 177
Baitylos 39, 190, 202-203
Barnett 241
Barr 5-6, 43, 50-51, 53, 70 n. 21, 72 n. 30, 92 n. 94, 167 n. 151, 175 n. 196, 199 n. 112, 218 n. 15, 226 n. 73, 254 n. 30, 265
Baudissin 67, 90 n. 91, 92 n. 94, 167 n. 148, 210, 212 n. 194, 220 n. 30, 228 n. 82, 228 n. 84, 229, 230 n. 92, 230 n. 93, 230 n. 96, 230 n. 97, 231 n. 100, 231 n. 102

---

* For all authors see also the Index of Passages. These Indices were prepared by Ms. Shelley Sternberg, Hamilton, Ontario to whom the author's thanks are due.

Baumgarten 239 n. 140
Baur 203 n. 137
Beare 37 n. 23
Beaujeu 77 n. 45
Beirut 3, 46 n. 26, 46 n. 27, 47, 48, 49, 52, 53, 55, 57, 60, 186, 195, 209, 224, 229
Ben Sira 156
Benz 43 n. 15, 95 n. 3, 174 n. 188, 201 n. 125
Bernays 64 n. 2, 64 n. 7, 109, 117 n. 95, 150, 183, 232, 233 n. 110
Berossus 4
Berouth 186, 187
Bethel 203 n. 135
Betyls 190, 202-203
Bickerman 31 n. 1, 51, 57 n. 72, 65 n. 8, 82
Bidez 257 n. 50, 259 n. 57
Birt 34 n. 12
Bisi 84 n. 74
Blass 129 n. 136, 196 n. 90
Bleeker 71 n. 27, 73 n. 35
Blinkenberg 59 n. 83
Bochart 54 n. 58, 63 n. 1, 78, 144, 145, 165 n. 133, 186, 202, 209, 232
Bonner 147 n. 30
Boreos 86, 88
Bouche-Leclercq 252 n. 23
Bousset 115 n. 85, 120 n. 107, 125 n. 130
Boyance 124 n. 124
Boylan 71 n. 27, 73, 192 n. 63
Brandon 104 n. 32, 108 n. 51, 109 n. 54, 110 n. 59, 110 n. 61, 116 n. 87
Breccia 171 n. 171
Brown 81 n. 64, 243 n. 154
Buchsel 215 n. 6
Bunsen 7 n. 33, 69, 85 n. 78, 86 n. 80, 90-91, 98 n. 12, 105, 115 n. 86, 120, 145 n. 17, 148 n. 34, 154, 155, 159 n. 107, 173, 175 n. 194, 175 n. 196, 180, 186, 190 n. 52, 199, 205, 212, 216 n. 7, 232
Burney 102 n. 27
Byblos 35 n. 14, 44 n. 18, 57, 95 n. 3, 120, 160 n. 113, 171-173, 185, 186, 187, 195, 197, 201, 209, 212-213, 218, 224, 225-226, 227, 237-238, 242, 264

Cassuto 55 n. 63, 72 n. 29, 109 n. 53, 147, 156 n. 94, 184 n. 11, 184 n. 12, 186 n. 25, 196-197, 208 n. 168
Cazelles 175 n. 196
Celsus 258 n. 56
Chabot 42 n. 6
Chaos 101, 106-108, 109-110, 123, 127, 132, 240 n. 145
Charles 103 n. 29
Charroux 1 n. 2, 255 n. 34
Chehab 32 n. 3
Chemosh 203 n. 135
Cheyne 161 n. 115
Chna 232
Chousor 39, 72 n. 30, 95 n. 3, 134, 138, 140, 144 n. 8, 158 n. 104, 166-170, 178, 184 n. 12, 192 n. 65, 194
Clagett 255 n. 37
Clapham 3 n. 12, 4 n. 14, 58 n. 80, 69 n. 17, 70 n. 24, 71 n. 27, 72 n. 30, 79 n. 55, 84 n. 71, 84 n. 76, 88 n. 87, 92 n. 94, 98 n. 12, 105 n. 33, 105 n. 34, 105 n. 35, 107, 108 n. 52, 109 n. 53, 111 n. 64, 116 n. 94, 131-139, 145 n. 12, 148 n. 33, 148 n. 34, 149 n. 38, 152 n. 60, 152 n. 64, 158 n. 104, 166, 167, 169 n. 159, 170 n. 166, 171 n. 170, 171 n. 172, 173-174, 176 n. 201, 177 n. 206, 192 n. 65, 198 n. 101, 206 n. 152, 208 n. 165, 209 n. 177, 228 n. 81, 233 n. 115, 258 n. 53
Clemen 2 n. 4, 35 n. 14, 52 n. 47, 55 n. 61, 57 n. 77, 58 n. 80, 78 n. 52, 86 n. 80, 92 n. 94, 98, 114 n. 81, 146 n. 21, 148 n. 33, 149 n. 38, 152 n. 66, 155 n. 90, 161, 165 n. 137, 167 n. 148, 169, 170 n. 168, 173 n. 182, 176 n. 199, 176 n. 201, 180 n. 1, 188 n. 40, 190 n. 53, 192 n. 64, 193, 195, 204 n. 141, 205 n. 147, 206, 212, 223 n. 55, 224, 232 n. 108, 233 n. 112, 253 n. 28
Collart 69 n. 19, 69 n. 20
Contenau 176 n. 200
Conybeare 83 n. 69
Cook 112 n. 68, 112 n. 69, 168 n. 152, 257
Cooke 44, 84 n. 72, 149 n. 40, 151, 160 n. 110, 204, 225 n. 69
Corinth 221
Corpus Hermeticum 74 n. 39, 124-128
Court de Gebelin 1 n. 2

Cross 43, 102 n. 26, 106 n. 44, 132, 146-147, 151 n. 54, 171 n. 170, 184 n. 10, 184 n. 12, 185 n. 14, 188 n. 42, 192 n. 60, 208 n. 173, 219 n. 19, 223 n. 58, 226 n. 70
Cumberland 144
Cumont 80, 149 n. 38, 151 n. 57, 152, 228 n. 82, 257 n. 50, 259 n. 57

Dagon 190, 195, 205
Dahood 95 n. 2, 133 n. 153, 174, 185 n. 14
Danel 157, 197, 204, 219, 222
Danielou 120 n. 107
Debrunner 129 n. 136, 196 n. 90
Delatte 257 n. 50
Della Vida 184 n. 8
Demarous 144 n. 8, 195-197, 208, 211, 219, 220, 236, 239
Denniston 58 n. 81
Derchain 257 n. 50
DeVaux 232 n. 107, 248 n. 5, 248 n. 6
Devreese 117 n. 96
Dhorme 190 n. 52
Diodorus Siculus 141
Dionysios Skytobrachion 92 n. 94, 180, 243, 263
Dioskouroi 176-177, 198, 229
Dodd 124 n. 125
Dodwell 186
Domitian 33
Dornseiff 48 n. 29, 52 n. 47, 120, 137-138, 240 n. 145, 240 n. 146
Driver 56, 145 n. 16
Du Cange 209 n. 175
Du Mesnil du Buisson 4 n. 14, 4 n. 20, 39 n. 26, 44 n. 22, 48 n. 30, 72 n. 30, 108 n. 50, 144 n. 9, 147 n. 32, 149 n. 37, 151 n. 58, 160 n. 112, 160 n. 113, 163 n. 124, 165 n. 132, 168 n. 155, 172, 175 n. 192, 185 n. 19, 186, 187 n. 31, 193 n. 72, 195 n. 83, 198, 203 n. 138, 204 n. 145, 205 n. 147, 210 n. 188, 212 n. 194, 220 n. 28, 220 n. 33, 221 n. 39, 221 n. 40, 224 n. 62, 225 n. 69, 226 n. 70, 226 n. 73, 226 n. 74
Dunant 151
Dussaud 55 n. 65, 69 n. 17, 79, 112 n. 70, 196 n. 88, 210 n. 185, 232 n. 105, 232 n. 109, 233, 240 n. 146

Ea 166, 239
Ebeling 120 n. 106
Edelstein 229 n. 88
Egypt 36, 46, 60, 67, 68, 69, 72, 73-74, 79, 80, 87 n. 84, 93, 104, 113, 116, 121, 138, 225, 227, 239 n. 140, 253, 256-257, 258, 263
Eisirios 232-235
Eissfeldt 1 n. 3, 2 n. 4, 2 n. 5, 3-4, 6 n. 29, 32 n. 4, 36 n. 18, 45 n. 25, 48-50, 52 n. 47, 52-54, 55, 56, 57 n. 76, 58 n. 79, 58 n. 80, 67, 70, 78-79, 89-90, 92 n. 94, 95 n. 3, 103 n. 29, 107-108, 111, 118-119, 140 n. 2, 144 n. 6, 149 n. 41, 152 n. 65, 153, 154 n. 81, 155 n. 90, 155 n. 91, 156, 157, 160, 162, 165 n. 134, 166 n. 141, 167 n. 149, 185 n. 13, 186 n. 22, 198 n. 105, 199, 203 n. 134, 207, 212 n. 193, 214, 233, 235 n. 121, 238 n. 138, 251 n. 21, 252 n. 25, 253 n. 27, 253 n. 28, 254 n. 31, 256
El = Kronos 38, 39, 52, 76, 95 n. 3, 100, 101-102, 106, 107, 144 n. 8, 149 n. 41, 150, 166, 174, 180, 184-186, 189-192, 194-195, 196, 197-227, 235-237, 239, 242, 243, 247, 249, 251-252, 256, 258, 260, 263-264
Elagabalus 224
Eliade 116 n. 88
Elioun 180, 183-186, 187, 189, 198, 204-205, 214, 217
Elohim 199, 243
Epeeis 257
Erichthonios 170
Erman 80 n. 57
Eros 101, 111, 122, 132-133, 205, 240 n. 145
Esarhaddon 149 n. 41, 202
Esau 160-161, 163
Eshmun 210, 228-231
Eshmunazar 189
Eudemus 128, 133
Euhemerus 69, 76-77, 87, 180, 232, 262-263
Euhemerism 38-39, 75, 80-82, 84, 92, 140, 144, 146, 153, 157, 171, 177, 183, 187-188, 191, 198, 199, 202, 217, 220, 226-227, 232, 236, 242-243, 248, 254, 262-263, 265

Ewald 115 n. 86, 116, 144 n. 9, 168, 171 n. 169, 195, 253 n. 28

Farnell 221 n. 38, 221 n. 39
Festugière 74, 83 n. 68
Fisher 132
Forrer 3 n. 8
Frankfort 108 n. 50
Frazer 222 n. 46
Freudenthal 36 n. 20, 37

Gaisford 46
Gardiner 225 n. 65
Gaster 87 n. 83, 166, 168 n. 151, 170, 186 n. 23
Ge 85, 188-191, 200, 236-237, 239, 242
Geinos Autochton 158 n. 104, 169-170, 179
Genea 149, 158, 161, 177
Genos 142 n. 5, 149, 158, 161, 177
Gese 56 n. 67, 60 n. 86
Gideon 54 n. 58
Gifford 41 n. 1, 63 n. 1, 84 n. 75, 91, 235
Gilgamesh 157 n. 100
Ginsberg 55 n. 65, 56, 112 n. 71, 197 n. 93, 198 n. 101, 198 n. 102, 208 n. 168, 208 n. 173, 230 n. 94
Ginzberg 72 n. 29, 156 n. 98, 156 n. 99, 157 n. 101, 160 n. 114, 173 n. 179, 173 n. 180
Gossen-Steier 255 n. 36
Grant 120 n. 107
Greece, Greek, Greeks 1, 4, 6, 38-39, 44, 45, 51, 59, 68, 79, 80, 82-83, 102-103, 113, 114, 116, 121-124, 129, 146-148, 166, 169, 170, 175, 176, 178-179, 180, 185, 189, 190, 191-192, 193, 194, 195, 200-201, 204, 207, 208, 213, 214, 220, 221, 223, 235-236, 238-242, 259, 267, 268
Greenfield 102 n. 26
Gruppe 64 n. 5, 98 n. 9, 167 n. 147, 176 n. 201, 193, 196, 224, 250 n. 11, 254 n. 30
Gudemann 35 n. 14
Güterbock 3, 190 n. 50, 237 n. 129, 240
Guthrie 108 n. 50, 113 n. 76, 113 n. 77, 123 n. 122, 176 n. 204, 176 n. 205, 177 n. 206, 210 n. 187
Gutschmid 256

Hadrian 32, 33, 261
Halevy 6 n. 29, 110 n. 62
Halieus 165-166
Harris 42 n. 10, 44 n. 21, 148 n. 34, 168 n. 154, 186 n. 29, 188 n. 39, 189 n. 44, 190 n. 52
Hecataeus of Abdera 68, 82
Heimarmene 201
Held 54 n. 58, 112 n. 71, 144 n. 11, 144 n. 12, 147 n. 27, 147 n. 29, 153 n. 70, 169 n. 156, 196 n. 85, 208 n. 173
Helios 151
Hellanicus 124
Henry 36
Hera 189
Herakles. See also Melqart. 59
Herennius Severus 31, 32, 33, 34
Hermopolis 108, 109, 110, 113, 115-117, 120, 130, 137-138
Herodian of Alexandria 34, 35
Hesiod 1-3, 89 n. 89, 94, 100-101, 111, 122, 132-133, 180, 191, 217, 235-243, 262, 264, 267
Hierombalos 54-59, 89-91, 267
Hieronymus 124
Hill 32 n. 3, 162 n. 121, 164 n. 129, 165 n. 130, 202 n. 128, 202 n. 129, 202 n. 130, 206 n. 156, 209 n. 178, 220 n. 33, 224 n. 60, 224 n. 61, 225 n. 69, 226 n. 90, 268
Hinnells 255 n. 40
Hirschfeld 44-45
Höfer 147 n. 30, 205 n. 148, 220 n. 29
Hölscher 98 n. 12, 100-103, 107, 240 n. 146
Homer 57, 91, 267
Hora 201
How 69 n. 15
Humbert 232 n. 109
Hvidberg-Hansen 149 n. 41, 171 n. 169
Hyn 170

Ieuo 54-55
il ṣpn 154
Ingholt 78 n. 51, 155 n. 88
Iriarte 47 n. 28
Isis 220, 224

Jacob 160 n. 114, 163
Jacobsen 113 n. 74
Jacoby 6-7, 31 n. 2, 33 n. 8, 42 n. 4. 57 n. 77, 81 n. 64, 85-86, 97 n. 8, 141 n. 4, 187 n. 32, 205, 225 n. 66, 227 n. 78 235, 244 n. 1, 254 n. 30
Jaeger 122 n. 115
Jensen 164 n. 128
Jeremiah 54
Jews 35-36, 52-54, 59-60, 76, 90, 102, 118, 156-157, 163-164, 249-250
Jonas 128 n. 134
Jubilees 132

Kabeiroi 167, 176, 224, 227, 229
Kadmos 59, 148 n. 34, 233, 268
Kahn 122
Kapelrud 166, 196 n. 91, 221 n. 37, 223 n. 54
Katz 99 n. 13
Kaztenstein 150 n. 45
Keller 255 n. 39
Kenyon 88 n. 86
Kimchi 118 n. 101
Kingu 136, 139-140
Kirk & Raven 3 n. 10, 79 n. 56, 107 n. 48, 121 n. 113, 212 n. 198, 258 n. 53, 258 n. 54
Kneph 257
Kolpia 88, 143-146, 148, 158, 177
Kumarbi 3, 100, 101-102, 107, 237 n. 129, 238, 239, 240
Kuster 31 n. 2

Lack 184 n. 9, 185 n. 13, 185 n. 17
Lackeit 146 n. 25
Lagrange 98, 148 n. 34, 154, 170, 172 n. 176, 188, 192-193, 194 n. 77, 199, 204, 206 n. 155, 222 n. 47, 225, 254 n. 30
Lambert 108 n. 52
Lamech 156 n. 98
Lampe 215 n. 6, 227 n. 79
Leglay 149 n. 41, 155, 174 n. 185
Leipoldt 80 n. 58
Leisegang 258 n. 56
Lenschau 60 n. 86
Lesky 2 n. 7
Levy 76 n. 42
Lewy 167 n. 150
Lindos 59
Lipinski 43 n. 13, 154, 155 n. 86, 212 n. 194
Littleton 217 n. 10, 217 n. 11, 218 n. 12, 222 n. 49, 237 n. 129, 237 n. 132, 239 n. 143, 241 n. 147
Liveriani 175 n. 197
Lobeck 46 n. 26, 253 n. 28
Loewenstamm 5 n. 24, 54 n. 54, 89 n. 88, 92 n. 94, 108 n. 50, 137 n. 171, 140 n. 1, 175 n. 193, 185 n. 19, 186 n. 26, 200, 208 n. 173, 217 n. 9, 218-219, 220 n. 32, 222 n. 47, 238 n. 138
Lokkegaard 70-71, 90 n. 91, 98 n. 11, 108 n. 50, 115 n. 85, 116 n. 94, 118 n. 100, 112 n. 112, 140, 144, 145, 149, 151 n. 57, 152, 163, 167 n. 148, 168-169, 170, 171, 173, 176 n. 201, 190 n. 53, 193, 196, 199 n. 112, 201, 202, 207-208, 209 n. 174, 219, 232 n. 104
Lotan 208-209
Lucian 77, 255 n. 40
Lukas 116 n. 88

Manetho 4
Marcus Aurelius 32, 34
Marduk 72 n. 29, 131-138, 239-240
Margulis 173 n. 179
Mariette 73 n. 35, 73 n. 37
Maspero 110 n. 61
McCarthy 137
McCasland 231 n. 102
McKenzie 118 n. 101
Meissner 117 n. 97
Melqart 160 n. 113, 180, 195 n. 83, 209-210, 220
Meyer 54 n. 58, 95 n. 3, 166 n. 41, 175 n. 192
Milik 43, 44 n. 19, 78 n. 51, 155 n. 88, 157 n. 100, 164 n. 127, 203 n. 135, 203 n. 136, 203 n. 138
Miller 5, 49 n. 35, 153, 199 n. 107, 217 n. 11, 218 n. 12
Misor 70, 144 n. 8, 175-177, 231, 240 n. 145
Moloch 248-249
Montgomery 146 n. 26

Moor 147 n. 32, 175 n. 198
Morenz 80 n. 58
Morey 171 n. 171
Moscati 201 n. 122
Moses 50, 51, 59, 61-62
Mot = Mouth 95 n. 3, 107, 112-113, 205 n. 147, 219, 223
Mōt 96, 107, 111-113, 115-117, 123, 128, 133-135
Moulten 65 n. 7, 116 n. 92
Movers 42 n. 11, 54, 114 n. 80, 253 n. 28
Mowan 155 n. 86
Mras 7, 47 n. 26, 67 n. 10, 78 n. 52, 84 n. 70, 105 n. 35, 111 n. 66, 111 n. 67, 141 n. 4, 184 n. 3, 195 n. 79, 212, 235, 240 n. 146
Muhly 240 n. 146
Mulder 5 n. 24, 151 n. 53, 218, 237 n. 132
Muller 7 n. 33, 40, 41 n. 1
Murtonen 55 n. 61
Musurillo 35 n. 16

Nagel 70 n. 23
Nautin 3 n. 10, 57 n. 71, 57 n. 76, 63 n. 1, 67, 78 n. 52, 79, 89-90, 232 n. 109
Naveh 175 n. 197
Nephilim 156
Nereus 207
Nero 33, 34, 257
Niese 33 n. 6
Nilsson 257 n. 46
Nimrod 173 n. 180
Nisibis 205-206
Noah 156 n. 98, 239 n. 140
Nock 83 n. 68, 108 n. 49, 124 n. 125, 128 n. 135, 146 n. 23, 146 n. 24, 192 n. 61
Nöldecke 42 n. 11, 57 n. 77
Nonnus 163, 178
Noth 54 n. 58, 70
Notos 86, 88
Nyberg 185 n. 14

Oden 5 n. 28, 6 n. 32, 84 n. 70, 243 n. 154
Oldenburg 4-5, 55 n. 65, 76 n. 41, 106 n. 41, 150-151, 167, 168 n. 152, 170 n. 166, 185 n. 20, 190 n. 52, 193 n. 70, 196 n. 88, 208 n. 173, 210 n. 188, 217-219, 220 n. 28, 221 n. 41, 226 n. 70, 237 n. 132
Orelli 7 n. 33, 40, 42 n. 11, 54-55, 65 n. 8, 86 n. 80, 112 n. 68, 145 n. 18, 153 n. 72, 154, 173 n. 182, 194 n. 77, 221, 223, 228, 253 n. 28
Origen 37, 156 n. 97, 249
Orlinsky 156 n. 95
Orpheus 47
Ostanes 80, 259
Ouranos 39, 85, 187-188, 189-192, 194-195, 196, 199, 200, 201, 202, 211-212, 214, 222, 236-237, 242, 243, 251-252
Ousoos 144 n. 8, 158 n. 104, 159-165, 167, 178

Palmyra 78, 151, 185, 206
Parente 6 n. 32, 78 n. 218
Patoikoi 168
Paul of Tyre 35
Pausanias 230-231, 268
Peckham 43 n. 17, 154, 160 n. 108
Peraia 205-207
Persephone 192-193
Pétrement 120 n. 107
Pfeiffer 103 n. 29
Pibechos 80
Pherekydes 258
Philo Judaeus 51, 123 n. 120
Phlox 142 n. 5, 152-153, 161, 165 n. 135
Phoenicia, Phoenician, Phoenicians 1, 3, 4, 5, 38-39, 42, 43 n. 16, 44, 46, 47, 49-51, 52, 54, 57, 60, 67, 69-72, 84, 93, 95, 96, 99, 102-103, 104, 106, 111, 118-119, 120-121, 128, 129-130, 140, 147-148, 149, 150-152, 155, 157, 159, 160-161, 161-162, 164, 165, 168, 170 n. 168, 171-173, 174, 175, 178, 180, 184, 186, 188, 189, 192-193, 195, 197, 200-201, 202, 204, 209, 213, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 226, 229-231, 234-235, 236-242, 248-250, 253, 256-257, 258, 260, 262, 264, 265, 266-268
Phos 142 n. 5, 152-153, 161, 165 n. 135
Pliny the Younger 34-35
Plutarch 76-77, 268
Pontos 207-208, 209, 211, 224, 236
Pope 71-72, 106 n. 41, 112, 154 n. 80, 171 n. 172, 185 n. 20, 200 n. 113, 200 n. 115, 218, 220 n. 28, 225 n. 67, 228 n. 83
Porphyry 4, 39 n. 26, 46-49, 51-56, 57-62, 63, 66-68, 73 n. 31, 78 n. 46, 78 n. 47,

88-92, 221 n. 42, 222 n. 50, 242-244, 261-262, 266-267
Posener 49
Poseidon 207-208, 209, 224
Pothos 106, 110-111, 112, 121, 122, 127, 132-133, 205
Protogonos 86, 88, 142 n. 5, 146-148, 158, 161, 177
Ptah 73, 168 n. 151
Pyr 142 n. 5, 152-153, 161, 165 n. 135
Pythagoreans 253 n. 29

Rab 119
Rabbinowicz 119 n. 103
Rabin 102 n. 27
Rashi 78, 222 n. 45
Reed 84 n. 77
Reitzenstein 80 n. 62, 257 n. 48
Renan 58, 92 n. 94, 98, 152 n. 65, 253 n. 28, 256
Rephaim 173
Resheph 95 n. 3, 206, 210
Rhea 200-201, 204
Robertson 103 n. 30
Rofé 203 n. 138, 214 n. 4, 217 n. 9
Rohde 33
Rollig 171 n. 172, 220 n. 28, 228 n. 83
Röscher 221 n. 35
Rose 147 n. 31, 166 n. 144, 173 n. 178, 176 n. 203, 193 n. 72, 200 n. 117, 201 n. 122, 207 n. 159, 221 n. 35
Rosenberg 175 n. 197
Ross 151 n. 59
Rostovtzeff 203 n. 137

Sadid 199
Sambursky 123 n. 121
Samemroumos 158 n. 104, 159-165, 167, 178
Samuel 119
Saturn 198, 199
Scaliger 1 n. 1, 36, 160 n. 114, 165
Schaeffer 225 n. 68
Schaublin 222 n. 50
Schlumberger 149 n. 38
Schmidt 72 n. 28
Schöne 33 n. 6, 61 n. 88
Schröder 44
Schwabl 96 n. 5, 116 n. 93, 120, 211, 217 n. 11, 241 n. 150, 242 n. 153
Scott 124-125
Segal 102 n. 28
Semiramis 47, 48, 51, 56-57, 59, 60-62
Sethe 110 n. 60
Seyrig 149 n. 38, 151, 206 n. 158, 210 n. 184, 219 n. 22, 220 n. 31, 220 n. 33, 230 n. 94
Shamash 176
Shemhazai 156
Sherwin-White 34 n. 13
Sidon 46, 47, 48, 92 n. 94, 110-111, 112 n. 69, 121, 122, 158 n. 104, 160-163, 195, 209, 219, 229
Skehan 214 n. 3
Smallwood 34 n. 10
Smith 65 n. 8, 79, 95, 110 n. 58, 118 n. 101, 137 n. 172, 159 n. 105, 164 n. 129, 210 n. 183, 248, 249 n. 10
Speiser 109 n. 57, 232 n. 107
Speyer 80 n. 58, 80 n. 63
Spiegel 115, 157, 164 n. 127, 169 n. 159
Spoerri 108, 123 n. 122, 141 n. 3
Starcky 78 n. 51, 149 n. 38, 151 n. 55
Steiner 241
Socrates 37, 122 n. 114
Suidas 31 n. 1, 32-35, 46-47, 256, 258, 261, 266
Sydyk 70, 144 n. 8, 175-177, 205, 227-231, 240 n. 145
Syncellus 61

Taautos 39, 44-45, 67-74, 77-80, 89-91, 96, 120, 137-138, 167 n. 151, 176, 192, 194, 224-225, 227, 232, 233-235, 254, 255-257, 258
Technites 169-170
Teixidor 43 n. 17, 44 n. 19, 78 n. 51, 95 n. 2, 95 n. 3, 147 n. 32, 149 n. 38, 151 n. 56, 152 n. 60, 154 n. 80, 160 n. 110, 166 n. 138, 171 n. 169, 175 n. 197, 190 n. 54, 198 n. 101, 201 n. 125, 203 n. 138, 206 n. 153, 210 n. 183, 210 n. 189, 249 n. 9, 249 n. 10, 268
Thabion 232, 236, 238
Thales 123
Themis 240 n. 145
Tiamat 110 n. 61, 113, 131-138, 239
Tigay 154 n. 80
Titans 173, 191, 199, 211, 243
Torrey 199 n. 109

Trajan 33, 34, 35
Troiani 5, 6, 34 n. 10, 34 n. 12, 35 n. 14, 35 n. 15, 36 n. 17, 53 n. 50, 55 n. 64, 56 n. 70, 57 n. 71, 59 n. 85, 76, 77 n. 45, 78 n. 52, 84 n. 71, 92 n. 94, 107 n. 47, 112 n. 68, 112 n. 72, 115 n. 85, 120 n. 110, 144 n. 6, 144 n. 9, 151 n. 57, 152 n. 67, 155 n. 90, 163 n. 123, 167 n. 150, 169 n. 157, 172 n. 175, 177 n. 209, 188 n. 36, 221 n. 41, 226 n. 71, 226 n. 74, 241 n. 148, 265
Trojan War 48, 51, 55, 56, 59-60, 61, 82, 89, 91, 94
Turner 65 n. 7, 116 n. 92
Typho 4, 208-209, 239
Tyre 32, 45, 46, 48, 49, 57, 60, 149 n. 41, 150, 157, 158 n. 104, 159, 161-165, 178, 197, 212-213, 219, 220, 224, 227, 229 n. 89, 264, 268

Ugarit 2-6, 39, 78-79, 84, 95, 98, 99, 104, 106, 118, 128, 131-139, 144-145, 152-154, 160-161, 163, 166-169, 170, 171, 173, 175, 177 n. 206, 188, 189, 192, 193, 195-197, 200, 204, 207-208, 213, 217-219, 222, 223, 225, 232, 233, 236-237, 240, 241, 262, 264, 265

Vallauri 81 n. 64
Van Selms 189 n. 46
Vian 191 n. 58, 208 n. 171
Vincent 193 n. 67
Virolleaud 2, 170 n. 165
Visser 257 n. 46
Von Rad 222 n. 45

Wagenfeld 1 n. 2, 39-40, 86 n. 80
Walcot 4, 56 n. 67, 58, 108 n. 52, 191 n. 59, 217 n. 10, 236 n. 123, 239, 258 n. 53
Weber 32 n. 3
Weinfeld 210 n. 184, 247 n. 3, 248-249, 252 n. 22
Welhausen 163 n. 123
Wells 69 n. 15
West 94 n. 1, 98 n. 12, 191 n. 55, 191 n. 56, 198 n. 103, 208, 236 n. 123, 238 n. 138, 239 n. 141, 240 n. 146, 241
Westermann 31 n. 2, 34
Wilcken 257 n. 47
Will 165 n. 129, 221 n. 39
Williams 5, 7 n. 33, 38 n. 24, 41 n. 2, 46 n. 27, 51 n. 44, 52 n. 45, 54 n. 54, 57 n. 75, 64 n. 3, 64 n. 4, 64 n. 5, 69 n. 15, 70 n. 24, 76, 83 n. 68, 84, 90 n. 91, 92 n. 94, 98 n. 12, 113 n. 74, 115 n. 86, 124 n. 123, 150, 159 n. 106, 161, 165, 166 n. 140, 167 n. 148, 175 n. 195, 176, 177 n. 207, 180 n. 1, 184 n. 3, 184 n. 7, 188, 190 n. 50, 206, 208, 209 n. 176, 212 n. 195, 221 n. 42, 235, 251 n. 20, 252 n. 25, 252 n. 26, 253 n. 28, 254 n. 31, 257
Wilson 113 n. 78, 117 n. 97

Yadin 152 n. 62
Yam 55, 131-134, 137-139, 207-208, 211, 236
Yeoud 52-53, 199, 249
Yw 55

Zeus 81, 149-151, 189, 191, 192, 196, 201 n. 122, 209, 211, 214 n. 4, 217, 221, 223 n. 58, 227, 237
Zeus Hypsistos 185
Zeus Kassios 153-154, 156
Zeus Meilichios 168-169
Zophasemin 96, 114-115, 119-120, 124
Zoroaster 259
Zuntz 202 n. 132

INDEX OF PASSAGES

HEBREW BIBLE

Genesis
1-2:3a 101, 103
1 98, 101, 104, 120, 132, 146 n. 19
1:2 106, 109, 144, 146
1:29 146
2:7 188 n. 38
3:14 254 n. 33
4:17 140 n. 1
6:1-4 156
6:1 156 n. 97
6:2 214 n. 2
7:11 186 n. 30
9:3 146
10:8-9 173 n. 180
14:5 220
14:18 184
14:19 106 n. 44
14:22 106 n. 44, 184 n. 10
17:23-27 222 n. 48
18 187 n. 33
21:33 147
22:12 251 n. 21
22:16 251 n. 21
28 202
30:20 197 n. 98

Exodus
4:24 222 n. 47
5:8 169 n. 160
14:21 145 n. 12

Leviticus
26:30 78

Numbers
11:34 70
13:33 156 n. 96
18:19 176
34:7 70
34:8 70
34:10 70

Deuteronomy
3:9 154 n. 81
4:19 93
21:1-9 222
32:1 188 n. 40
32:4 175 n. 193
32:8-9 214
32:8 184 n. 11, 217
32:21 217 n. 9
32:26 144
32:39 217 n. 9
33:12 185 n. 14
33:18-19 155 n. 91

Judges
3:3 154
5:30 195 n. 80
8:33 186
9:4 186
9:46 186
11:34-40 193
11:34 251 n. 21

1 Samuel
5 190 n. 52

2 Samuel
16:21 195 n. 81
21:1-14 222

1 Kings
2:17 195 n. 81
16:29-19:21 210 n. 189

2 Kings
3:21-27 248
17:30 43 n. 17
22:8 58 n. 80, 80 n. 59

Isaiah
5:14 112

6:2 225 n. 69
11:4 174 n. 193
14:12 198
21:12 145 n. 16
22:15 44 n. 18
27:1 208 n. 168
29:5-6 135 n. 166
40:28 147
45:6-8 118 n. 101
55:10 118

Jeremiah
7:18 55 n. 62
10:13 118
16:16 165 n. 134
44:15-19 55 n. 62
48:13 203

Ezechiel
1:6 225 n. 69
9:4 70
28:2 106 n. 41

Hosea
5:1 155 n. 91
7:16 185
11:7 185

Micah
7:1 148 n. 34
Psalms
13:16 185 n. 14
18:12 (17:12) 105 n. 37
18:14 185 n. 15
21:8 185 n. 15
46:5 185 n. 16
50:14 185 n. 16
51:8 71
53:3 185 n. 16
66:19 133
74:13-14 138 n. 175
77:17-19 131 n. 141, 135 n. 166, 138 n. 175
77:17 118
78:56 185 n. 16
83:19 185 n. 15
89:10-11 138 n. 175
91:9 185 n. 15
92:2 185 n. 15
93:1-4 138 n. 175
104:4 153
121:3 133
139:8 99 n. 15

Proverbs
4:3 250 n. 16
8:6 175 n. 193

Job
1:6 214 n. 2
26:5-14 131 n. 142
26:12-13 131 n. 141, 138 n. 175
28:24 147 n. 29
38:7 214 n. 2
38:36 71-72

Ecclesiastes
11:3 118 n. 101

Daniel
4:10 115 n. 83
6:19 145

APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

Ben Sira
11:35 102 n. 28
13:3 102 n. 28
17:17 217 n. 9
20:18 102 n. 28
24:3 102 n. 28

Enoch
1:5 114 n. 82
6-8 156 n. 99
12:4 114 n. 82
46 102 n. 27

Jubilees
22:11-23 102 n. 27

Judith
9:1-4 102 n. 27
16:1-25 102 n. 27

1 Maccabees
3:1-9 102 n. 27

RABBINICA

Mishnah
Gittin
4:2-5:9 88 n. 87

Genesis Rabbah
p. 55 (Theodor-Albeck) 148 n. 36

Babylonian Talmud
Berachot 59a 119
Yoma 67b 163 n. 125
Baba Bathra 72 b 232 n. 106

PRE
22 156 n. 98

Yalkut Genesis
44 164 n. 127

DEAD SEA SCROLLS

DSD
X:16-20 102 n. 27
DST
V:20-23 102 n. 27
DSW
XI:13-15 102 n. 27
Gen. Apoc. Qumran
Col. 2 156 n. 98

UGARITIC TEXTS

R.S.
20.24 166 n. 145
24.245 174 n. 191
24.250 160 n. 112
24.252 174 n. 190
24.271 175 n. 198
24.281 147 n. 32

Gordon, *UT*
2:17 225 n. 64
17:7 225 n. 64
17:10 152
49:II:21 112
49:III:4-21 219
51:I:24 167 n. 150
51:IV:20-22 106 n. 41
51:V:115-118 131
51:VI:1ff. 169 n. 159
51:VI:30-40 167 n. 150
51:VII:28 144 n. 12
51:VII:38-39 196 n. 87
51:VIII:1ff. 112
52:34 207 n. 163
52:57 177 n. 206
62 56
62:50 133
64:12 95 n. 2
67:I:1 208 n. 168
67:V:6ff. 118 n. 98, 193
67:VI:11-25 219
68:1ff. 131 n. 141, 134 n. 157
68:7 73 n. 30
68:11ff. 138, 166, 194 n. 75
68:25-27 73 n. 30
76:III:6-7 147 n. 27
77:5ff. 204 n. 144
77:45-50 204 n. 145
121:4 201 n. 124
126:III:5-8 185 n. 13
126:V:35 166 n. 142
137:36-37 196 n. 88
146:2 44 n. 18
1 Aqht:42-46 222 n. 44
1 Aqht:45 197 n. 92
2 Aqht:I:17 219
2 Aqht:I:25 106 n. 43
2 Aqht:I:27 84 n. 76
2 Aqht:II:39 204 n. 142
2 Aqht:II:43ff. 204 n. 143
Krt:37 106 n. 42
Krt:76-77 225 n. 67
ʿnt:II:5ff. 193 n. 72

nt:III:35ff. 194 n. 78
nt:III:37-38 208 n. 167
nt:III:43 152 n. 68, 153 n. 70
nt:VI:10-11 167
nt:VI:14-16 73 n. 30

AKKADIAN TEXTS

Enuma Elish
I,95-98 226
IV, 100 134
IV, 105-120 136

GREEK AND LATIN AUTHORS

Aelian
NA
6,18 254 n. 33, 255 n. 35

Anaximander
DK A 11 122
DK A 30 123

Anaximenes
DK A 5 123

Apollodorus
Bib.
1,4 191 n. 57
1, 6, 3 153 n. 79
Aristophanes
Av.
693ff. 123-124
696 122 n. 119
Nu.
364-426 122 n. 114
816-830 122 n. 114

Aristotle
MA
9 254 n. 33
Met.
A3, 983b6 123

Athenaeus
Deipn.
3, 126 43 n. 15, 45-48

Athenagoras
Pro Christ.
18 124 n. 123

Berossus *FGrH* 680
F 1,7 135
F 8, 142 60 n. 87
F 12 106 n. 40

Corpus Hermeticum
I 125 n. 129
I, 11 120 n. 107
III 103, 124-125, 128
III, 1 125
III, 4 125
XI 146
XVI, 1 82-83

Chrysippus
SVF II, 429 106 n. 39

Cicero
Ad Att.
IV, 4b 37

DND
3, 16, 42 195 n. 83

Clement of Alexandria
Strom.
1, 16 234 n. 119
5, 14, 98 37

Curtius Rufus
IV, III, 15, 23 49-50, 248

Damascius
De Prim. Princ.
123bis 124 n. 123

Vita Isidori
F 115 190 n. 52
F 203 202 n. 126
F 348 228-230

Dionysios Skytobrachion *FGrH* 32
F 7,56,3 146 n. 22, 243
F 7, 56, 5 188 n. 35, 243
F 7, 57, 1 190 n. 54, 199 n. 111, 243
F 7, 57, 2 188 n. 36, 189 n. 43, 243
F 7, 60, 1 190 n. 53, 243
F 7, 60, 4 199 n. 111, 227 n. 77, 243
F 7, 61, 1 243
F 8, 73, 6 227 n. 77

Diodorus Siculus
1,7,1-7 107-108, 123
1,7,7 88 n. 85
1,8,1 146 n. 20
2 105 n. 35
2, 30,3 190 n. 51
5, 74,1 234-235
20, 14,4-6 248-249

Empedocles
DK B 1,17ff. 123
DK B 29 123

Epiphanius
Panarion haer.
25,5ff. 126-128

Eudemus *FGrH* 784
F 4 110 n. 62

Euhemerus *FGrH* 63
F 1 92 n. 94
F 2,2 84 n. 71, 87 n. 81
F 2,5 81 n. 63, 243
F 2,6 187 n. 34, 243
F 2,9 227 n. 76
F 3,46,8 81, 227 n. 80, 243
F 14 198 n. 99, 243
F 14 15 199 n. 110, 243
F 23 227 n. 75

Euripides
Ion
20 170 n. 167

Eusebius
Chronicon
p. 4 61-62

Filastrius
Haer.
33,3ff. 126-128

Hecataeus of Abdera *FGrH* 264
F 16, 1 68 n. 13
F 25, 15, 9 68 n. 13
F 25, 16, 2 192 n. 64

Herodotus
2,44 165 n. 132, 209 n. 179
2, 65-76 87 n. 84
2, 104 222 n. 49
2, 109 79 n. 56
2, 138, 4 69 n. 15
3, 37 168

Hesiod
Op.
109 212
Th.
120 122 n. 119
126ff. 188 n. 37
154ff. 190-191, 243
155-160 191
174 211
175 194 n. 76
178 211
190ff. 211 n. 192
283ff. 211
398 211
463-465 191 n. 59
468ff. 191 n. 59
507ff. 190, 243
746ff. 190, 198 n. 103
885 214 n. 4
888ff. 191 n. 59

Hestaios *FGrH* 786 186 n. 29

Hippocrates
Mul.
1,25 119 n. 105

Homer
  Il.
    1, 404 153 n. 73
    12, 240 105 n. 38
    14, 200f. 123
    15, 191 105 n. 38
    18, 476ff. 194 n. 75
    21, 56 105 n. 38
    23, 51 105 n. 38

Iamblichus
  Myst.
    8,5 79 n. 54
  Protrep.
    14 37

Josephus
  AJ
    1,73 156 n. 98
    12, 259 149 n. 39
  BJ
    1, 206 65 n. 8
    3, 44-47 206 n. 151
  CAp
    1, 11-14 82 n. 67
    1, 113 57 n. 73
    1, 117 57 n. 73
    1, 142 60 n. 87

Juvenal
  Sat.
    3, 62-65 209 n. 176

Kern, *OF*
  54 124 n. 123
  57 124 n. 123

Lucian
  Syr. D.
    8 212 n. 194

Lucretius
  5, 796-798 123 n. 122
  5, 806 123 n. 122
  6, 96-98 122 n. 118

Macrobius
  Sat.
    1,9,12 256 n. 41, 258 n. 56 259 n. 59

Malalas
  Chronikon
    443 (Dindorf) 59 n. 84
    8,199 (= *PG* 97, 311) 153 n. 79

Menander *FGrH* 783
  F 1 209

Mochos *FGrH* 784
  F 3b 148 n. 33
  F 4 110 n. 61, 110 n. 63, 116 n. 88, 134 n. 159
  F 6 148 n. 33

Nonnus
  Dion.
    2, 496-507 119 n. 104
    40 153
    40, 429-534 165 n. 131
    40, 535-575 157
    42-43 224 n. 59

Pausanias
  7, 23, 7-8 230-231, 268

Pherekydes
  DK 7 A 2 258

Philo Judaeus
  De Abr.
    178-183 250 n. 12
    184-200 250 n. 12
  Opif.
    73 135 n. 163
  V. Mosis
    2, 11 51 n. 43

Philostratus
  Life of Apollonius
    3, 32 83

Plato
  Phaedo
    81C 103 n. 29
  Symposium
    189Eff. 124, 148 n. 36
  Timaeus
    37C-38E 146
    41A-D 124
    77B 87 n. 82

Pliny
NH
6, 18 255 n. 35
7, 192 234 n. 118
7, 192-193 234 n. 116
13, 73 162 n. 118

Plutarch
De Iside
355A-D 76-77
357A-C 311 n. 137
357A-D 224 n. 63

Polybius
5,68,9 195 n. 82
7,9,2 188 n. 40

Porphyry
Kat. Christ.
55 (Harnack) 53

Ps. Tertullian
Adv. Omn. haer.
1,6 125-126, 127 n. 132, 128 n. 133

SVF
II, 439 123 n. 121
II, 440 123 n. 121
II, 449 123 n. 121
II, 715-716 254 n. 32

St. Augustine
Quaest in Hept.
PL 34,797 150 n. 47

Stephanus of Byzantium
βηρ 186 n. 29
ἵερος κόλπος 144 n. 7
περαία 205, 206

Strabo
16, 1, 7 206 n. 155
16, 2, 22 195 n. 82

Tacitus
Ann.
11, 14 234 n. 117
Hist.
3, 24-25 151 n. 57

Tertullian
Apol.
9,2 51, 248, 249

Theodoretus
Gr. Aff. Cur.
2,44 42 n. 4, 46, 54 n. 59
12, 24-25 37

Theophrastus
HP
4,8,4 162 n. 118
9,7,1 162 n. 118

Theopompus *FGrH* 115
F 114 209 n. 176

Varro
De Ling. Lat.
5, 10, 57 69

Xenophanes
DK B 11-12 200 n. 114

Xenophon
Mem.
3,5,25 116 n. 94

Zeno
SVF I, 103 123
SVF I, 117 122 n. 117

INSCRIPTIONS AND PAPYRI

CIL
VIII, 698 43 n. 16
VIII 5099 43 n. 15
XIII, 7041 54 n. 52

CIS
I, 2 95 n. 2
I, 5 154
I, 10 95 n. 2

I, 95 95 n. 2
I, 99 54 n. 58
I, 102 165 n. 137
I, 112a 42 n. 8, 43 n. 17
I, 118 42 n. 9, 43 n. 17, 45
I, 123 84 n. 72
I, 139 84 n. 72
I, 4851 43 n. 17
II, 3978 78 n. 49

IGLS
376 203 n. 138
751 166 n. 139, 189 n. 44
798 189 n. 44
1011 171 n. 171
1013 189 n. 44
1026 189 n. 44
1226 153 n. 79
1301 149 n. 38
2740 190 n. 51
2925 171 n. 170
2949 223 n. 58
2954 149 n. 38
2978 193 n. 67

KAI
1 44 n. 18, 102 n. 26
4 95 n. 2, 175 n. 193, 185, 201, 223 n. 57, 225 n. 64
5 95 n. 2, 201 n. 118, 201 n. 119, 223 n. 57
6 201 n. 118, 201 n. 119, 223 n. 57
7 201 n. 119, 223 n. 57
10 201 n. 119, 223 n. 57
11 223 n. 57
14 102 n. 26, 160 n. 109, 173 n. 181, 189 n. 47, 219 n. 26, 229 n. 89
15 160 n. 108, 229 n. 89
16 229 n. 89
17 219 n. 25, 219 n. 26
24 78 n. 50, 102 n. 26, 155
26 95 n. 2, 106 n. 44, 147 n. 28, 184, 189 n. 49
31 44 n. 1, 154
33 219 n. 25, 219 n. 26
39 206 n. 153
42 193 n. 71
47 209 n. 179, 209 n. 180, 210
49 165 n. 137
50 153 n. 77
58 43 n. 17
61 78 n. 50, 84 n. 72
64 84 n. 72
66 228 n. 82, 229 n. 89
78 95 n. 2, 174
81 219 n. 25, 219 n. 26
117 173 n. 181
128 223 n. 52
129 95 n. 2, 106 n. 44
136 223 n. 52
202 150 n. 42, 151-152
222 184, 188, 189 n. 49
258 43 n. 17
259 151

RES
2115 78 n. 49
2053 78 n. 49

ÉTUDES PRÉLIMINAIRES AUX RELIGIONS ORIENTALES DANS L'EMPIRE ROMAIN

Publiées par M. J. VERMASEREN

1. **Wessetzky, V.** Die ägyptischen Kulte zur Römerzeit in Ungarn. 1961. (iv, 56 p., frontisp., 21 fig. on 16 pl., 1 fold. map) [00550 1] Gld. 28.—

2. **Kádár, Z.** Die kleinasiatisch-syrischen Kulte zur Römerzeit in Ungarn. 1962. (iv, 86 p., frontisp., 8 pl., 1 fold. map) [02989 3] Gld. 24.—

3. **Squarciapino, M. F.** I culti orientali ad Ostia. 1962. (vii, 72 p., frontisp., 2 fig., 16 pl.) [00552 8] Gld. 24.—

4. **Toynbee, J. M. C.** A silver casket and strainer from the Walbrook Mithraeum in the City of London. 1963. (iv, 15 p., frontisp., 15 pl.) [00553 6] Gld. 20.—

5. **García y Bellido, A.** Les religions orientales dans l'Espagne romaine. 1967. (xiv, 166 p., frontisp., 19 fig., 20 pl.) [00554 4] Gld. 84.—

7. **Zotović, L.** Les cultes orientaux sur le territoire de la Mésie Supérieure. 1966. (x, 105 p., frontisp., 2 fig., 30 ill. on 16 pl.) [00556 0] Gld. 48.—

8. **Blawatsky, W.** et **G. Kochelenko.** Le culte de Mithra sur la côte septentrionale de la Mer Noire. 1966. (vi, 36 p., frontisp., 17 ill. on 16 pl., map) [00557 9] Gld. 36.—

9. **Vermaseren, M. J.** The legend of Attis in Greek and Roman art. 1966. (viii, 59 p., frontisp., 95 ill. on 40 pl.) [00558 7] Gld. 60.—

10. **Duthoy, R.** The Taurobolium. Its evolution and terminology. 1969. (xiv, 129 p., frontisp., map) [00559 5] *cloth* Gld. 60.—

12. **Grimm, G.** Die Zeugnisse ägyptischer Religion und Kunstelemente im römischen Deutschland. 1969. (x, 303 p., frontisp., 40 fig., 78 pl., 1 map) [00561 7] *cloth* Gld. 200.—

13. **Tudor, D.** Corpus monumentorum religionis equitum danuvinorum (CMRED).
I. The monuments. 1969. (xxii, 138 p., 91 pl., map) [00562 5] *cloth* Gld. 132.—
II. The analysis and interpretation of the monuments. 1976. (viii, 309 p., 15 pl., 2 maps) [04493 0] *cloth* Gld. 180.—

14. **Du Mesnil du Buisson, R.** Études sur les dieux phéniciens hérités par l'empire romain. 1970. (xx, 149 p., 35 fig., 10 pl.) [00563 3] *cloth* Gld. 76.—

15. **Salditt-Trappmann, R.** Tempel der ägyptischen Götter in Griechenland und an der Westküste Kleinasiens. 1970. (xv, 68 p., 1 fig., 30 pl., 6 plans) [00564 1] *cloth* Gld. 84.—

16. **Vermaseren, M. J.** Mithriaca.
I. The Mithraeum at S. Maria Capua Vetere. 1971. (xii, 59 p., 28 [20 col.] pl., 5 fig., 1 fold. plan) [02582 0] *cloth* Gld. 96.—
II. The Mithraeum at Ponza. 1974. (ix, 38 p., frontisp., 34 pl., 7 fig.) [03883 3] *cloth* Gld. 64.—
IV. Le monument d'Ottaviano Zeno et le culte de Mithra sur le Célius. 1978. (x, 64 p., frontisp., 1 fig., 38 pl.) [05808 7] *cloth* Gld. 64.—

17. **Tran tam Tinh, V.** Le culte des divinités orientales à Herculanum. 1971. (xii, 104 p., col. frontisp., 43 ill. on 29 pl., 1 fold. plan) [02583 9] *cloth* Gld. 116.—

18. **Leclant, J.** Inventaire bibliographique des Isiaca (IBIS). Répertoire analytique des travaux relatifs à la diffusion des cultes isiaques, 1940-1969. Avec la collaboration de G. Clerc.
I. A-D. 1972. (xvi, 190 p., frontisp., 21 pl.) [03463 3] *cloth* Gld. 96.—
II. E-K. 1974. (xii, 276 p., frontisp., 28 pl., 2 maps) [03981 3] *cloth* Gld. 136.—

19. **Lane, E. N.** Corpus monumentorum religionis dei Menis (CMRDM).
I. The monuments and inscriptions. 1971. (xii, 173 p., 36 fig., 105 pl., 2 fold. maps) [02584 7] *cloth* Gld. 216.—
II. The coins and gems. 1975. (xvi, 180 p., 72 pl., map) [04207 5] *cloth* Gld. 144.—
III. Interpretations and testimonia. 1976. (x, 145 p., 2 pl.) [04516 3] *cloth* Gld. 84.—
IV. Supplementary Men-inscriptions from Pisidia. 1978. (viii, 71 p., 57 pl.) [05649 1] *cloth* Gld. 96.—

20. **Roullet, A. H.** The Egyptian and Egyptianizing monuments of imperial Rome. 1972. (xvi, 184 p., 230 pl., 5 [fold.] plans) [03410 2] *cloth* Gld. 192.—

21. **Malaise, M.** Inventaire préliminaire des documents égyptiens découverts en Italie. 1972. (xvi, 400 p., frontisp., 64 pl., 14 maps, 4 plans) [03510 9] *cloth* Gld. 188.—

22. **Malaise, M.** Les conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des cultes égyptiens en Italie. 1972. (xiv, 529 p., frontisp., 3 fold. maps, numerous tab.) [03511 7] *cloth* Gld. 188.—

23. **Halsberghe, G. H.** The cult of Sol Invictus. 1972. (xii, 175 p., frontisp.) [03467 6] *cloth* Gld. 76.—

25. **Stambaugh, J. E.** Sarapis under the early Ptolemies. 1972. (xii, 102 p., 3 pl.) [03473 0] *cloth* Gld. 76.—

26. **Dunand, F.** Le culte d'Isis dans le bassin oriental de la Méditerranée.
I. Le culte d'Isis et les Ptolémées. 1973. (xxxii, 249 p., frontisp., 10 fig., 45 pl., 2 fold. maps) [03581 8] *cloth* Gld. 120.—

II. Le culte d'Isis en Grèce. 1973. (xii, 223 p., 7 fig., 45 pl., 3 fold. maps) [03582 6] *cloth* Gld. 96.—
III. Le culte d'Isis en Asie mineure. Clergé et rituel des sanctuaires isiaques. 1973. (xii, 400 p., 3 fig., 23 pl., 2 fold. maps) [03583 4] *cloth* Gld. 144.—

27. Tran tam Tinh, V. Le culte des divinités orientales en Campanie en dehors de Pompéi, de Stabies et d'Herculanum. 1972. (xxii, 261 p., 101 fig. on 73 pl., map) [03433 1] *cloth* Gld. 144.—

28. Corpus Cultus Deae Syriae (CCDS). I. Les sources littéraires.
1. **Van Berg, P.-L.** Répertoire des sources grecques et latines (sauf le *De dea syria*). 1972. (xxiv, 110 p., frontisp., fold. map) [03503 6] *cloth* Gld. 88.—
2. **Van Berg, P.-L.** Étude critique des sources mythographiques grecques et latines (sauf le *De dea syria*). 1972. (xx, 124 p., frontisp., 4 fig., fold. map) [03512 5] *cloth* Gld. 68.—

29. Burton, A. Diodorus Siculus, Book I. A commentary. 1972. (xxviii, 301 p., frontisp.) [03514 1] *cloth* Gld. 88.—

30. Turcan, R. Les religions de l'Asie dans la Vallée du Rhône. 1972. (x, 144 p., frontisp., 37 pl., 2 fold. maps) [03441 2] *cloth* Gld. 96.—

31. Sfameni Gasparro, G. I culti orientali in Sicilia. 1973. (xvi, 338 p., frontisp., 122 pl., 2 fold. maps) [03579 6] *cloth* Gld. 216.—

32. Hornborstel, W. Sarapis. Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte, den Erscheinungsformen und Wandlungen der Gestalt eines Gottes. 1973. (xix, 482 p., frontisp., 3 fig., 220 pl., 2 fold. maps) [03654 7] *cloth* Gld. 336.—

33. Du Mesnil du Buisson, R. Nouvelles études sur les dieux et les mythes de Canaan. 1973. (xxiii, 274 p., 133 fig., 19 pl.) [03670 9] *cloth* Gld. 116.—

34. Waldmann, H. Die kommagenischen Kultreformen unter König Mithradates I. Kallinikos und seinem Sohne Antiochus I. 1973. (xxiii, 247 p., col. frontisp., 16 fig., 38 pl., map, fold. synopsis) [03657 1] *cloth* Gld. 180.—

35. Fleischer, R. Artemis von Ephesos und verwandte Kultstatuen aus Anatolien und Syrien. 1973. (xviii, 450 p., frontisp., 2 fig., 171 pl., 2 fold. maps) [03677 6] *cloth* Gld. 260.—

36. Kater-Sibbes, G. J. F. A preliminary catalogue of Sarapis monuments. 1973. (xl, 230 p., frontisp., 33 pl., 12 [2 fold.] maps) [03750 0] *cloth* Gld. 108.—

37. Tran tam Tinh, V. et **Y. Labrecque.** Isis lactans. Corpus des monuments gréco-romains d'Isis allaitant Harpocrate. 1973. (xii, 225 p., 78 pl., fold. map) [03746 2] *cloth* Gld. 144.—

38. Moeller, W. O. The Mithraic origin and meanings of the rotas-sator square. 1973. (ix, 53 p., frontisp., 6 pl.) [03751 9] *cloth* Gld. 28.—

39. Apuleius of Madauros. The Isis-Book (Metamorphoses, Book XI). Edited with an introduction, translation and commentary by J. GWYN GRIFFITHS. 1975. (xviii, 439 p., frontisp.) [04270 9] *cloth* Gld. 140.—

40. Schwertheim, E. Die Denkmäler orientalischer Gottheiten im römischen Deutschland. Mit Ausnahme der ägyptischen Gottheiten. 1974. (x, 355 p., 121 pl., 25 fig., 2 fold. maps, frontisp.) [03984 8] *cloth* Gld. 196.—

41. Walters, V. J. The cult of Mithras in the Roman provinces of Gaul. 1974. (xiv, 175 p., 3 fig., 40 pl., 2 fold. maps, frontisp.) [04014 5] *cloth* Gld. 96.—

42. Ristow, G. Mithras im römischen Köln. 1974. (vi, 33 p., frontisp., 7 fig., 23 pl., fold. map) [03873 6] *cloth* Gld. 44.—

43. Lloyd, A. B. Herodotus, Book II.
I. Introduction. 1975. (xvi, 194 p.) [04181 8] *cloth* Gld. 76.—
II. Commentary 1-98. 1976. (iv, 397 p., fold. map) [04182 6] *cloth* Gld. 120.—

44. Engelmann, H. The Delian aretalogy of Sarapis. 1975. (viii, 63 p., frontisp., 1 fig.) [04202 4] *cloth* Gld. 48.—

45. Bruneau, P. Le sanctuaire et le culte des divinités égyptiennes à Érétrie. 1975. (x, 144 p., 8 fig., 36 pl.) [04185 0] *cloth* Gld. 116.—

46. Dunand, F. et **P. Lévêque.** Les syncrétismes dans les religions de l'antiquité. Colloque de Besançon (22-23 octobre 1973). 1975. (viii, 234 p., 8 pl.) [04332 2] *cloth* Gld. 116.—

47. Turcan, R. Mithras Platonicus. Recherches sur l'hellénisation philosophique de Mithra. 1975. (xii, 134 p., 5 pl.) [04353 5] *cloth* Gld. 88.—

48. Kater-Sibbes, G. J. F. and **M. J. Vermaseren.** Apis.
I. The monuments of the Hellenistic-Roman period from Egypt. 1975. (l, 65 p., col. frontisp., 4 fig., 134 pl., 2 maps) [04291 1] *cloth* Gld. 192.—
II. Monuments from outside Egypt. 1975. (ix, 107 p., col. frontisp., 11 fig., 211 [10 col.] pl., fold. map) [04293 8] *cloth* Gld. 276.—
III. Inscriptions, coins and addenda. 1977. (xii, 53 p., 28 pl., 2 fold. maps, col. frontisp.) [04779 4] *cloth* Gld. 72.—

49. Grandjean, Y. Une nouvelle arétalogie d'Isis à Maronée. 1975. (xiii, 134 p., col. frontisp., 5 pl.) [04337 3] *cloth* Gld. 84.—

50. Vermaseren, M. J. Corpus Cultus Cybelae Attidisque (CCCA).
II. Graecia atque Insulae. *in preparation*
III. Italia-Latium. 1977. (xxviii, 198 p., 10 figs., 302 ill., 1 fold. plan) [05400 6] *cloth* Gld. 290.—

IV. Italia-Aliae Provinciae. 1978. (xxxiv, 142 p., 24 fig., 111 pl., frontisp., 1 map) [05797 8] *cloth* Gld. 196.—
VII. Musea et collectiones privatae. 1977. (xvi, 67 p., frontisp., 1 fig., 115 pl.) [05454 5] *cloth* Gld. 144.—

51. **Heyob, S. K.** The cult of Isis among women in the Graeco-Roman world. 1975. (xix, 140 p.) [04368 3] *cloth* Gld. 76.—

52. **Kobylina, M. M.** Divinités orientales sur le littoral nord de la Mer Noire. Avec un appendice de O. J. Névérov. 1976. (vii, 70 p., 52 pl., 1 fold. plan) [04570 8] *cloth* Gld. 84.—

53. **Vermaseren, M. J.** e **P. Simoni.** Liber in deum. L'apoteosi di un iniziato Dionisiaco. 1976. (xv, 80 p., col. frontisp., 18 fig., 45 pl.) [04501 5] *cloth* Gld. 84.—

54. **Berciu, I.** et **C. C. Petolescu.** Les cultes orientaux dans la Dacie méridionale. 1976. (xvi, 71 p., 1 fold. map, 32 pl., frontisp.) [04519 8] *cloth* Gld. 80.—

55. **Brisson, L.** Le mythe de Tirésias. Essai d'analyse structurale. 1976. (x, 169 p., 9 pl., col. frontisp.) [04569 4] *cloth* Gld. 96.—

56. **Wytzes, J.** Der letzte Kampf des Heidentums in Rom. 1977. (xiv, 387 p., 34 fig. on 23 pl.) [04786 7] *cloth* Gld. 212.—

57. **Grenier, J.-C.** Anubis alexandrin et romain. 1977. (xxiv, 212 p., frontisp., 44 pl., 2 fold. maps) [04917 7] *cloth* Gld. 160.—

58. **Flamant, J.** Macrobe et le Néo-platonisme latin, à la fin du IVe siècle. 1977. (xxxii, 737 p.) [05406 5] *cloth* Gld. 360.—

59. **Hajjar, J.** La triade d'Héliopolis-Baalbek. Son culte et sa diffusion à travers les textes littéraires et les documents iconographiques et épigraphiques. 2 tomes. 1977. I. (xxxviii, 417 p.); II. (v, 224 p., 128 pl., 3 fold. maps) [04902 9] *set cloth* Gld. 368.—

60. **Soyez, B.** Byblos et la fête des Adonies. 1977. (ix, 94 p., 12 fig., 15 pl.) [04885 5] *cloth* Gld. 76.—

61. **Budischovsky, M.-C.** La diffusion des cultes isiaques autour de la Mer Adriatique. I. Inscriptions et monuments. 1977. (xx, 248 p., frontisp., 106 pl., fold. map) [05234 8] *cloth* Gld. 180.—

62. **Hölbl, G.** Beziehungen der ägyptischen Kultur zu Altitalien. 2 Bde. 1979. I. Textteil. (xxiv, 394 p., col. frontisp., 16 fig.); II. Katalog. (vi, 287 p., 5 fold. maps, 8 col. pl., 182 pl.) [05487 1] *set cloth* Gld. 480.—

63. **Speidel, M. P.** The religion of Iuppiter Dolichenus in the Roman army. 1978. (x, 93 p., col. frontisp., 24 pl., fold. map) [05398 0] *cloth* Gld. 96.—

64. **Collins-Clinton, J.** A late antique shrine of Liber Pater at Cosa. 1977. (x, 99 p., 9 fig., col. frontisp., 27 pl.) [05232 1] *cloth* Gld. 76.—

65. Padró i Parcerisa, J. Egyptian-type documents from the Mediterranean Littoral of the Iberian Peninsula before the Roman conquest. I. Introductory survey. 1980. (xxxvii, 74 p., frontisp., 5 maps, 28 pl.) [06139 8] Gld. 60.—

66. Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasiens. Festschrift für FRIEDRICH KARL DÖRNER zum 65. Geburtstag am 28. Februar 1976. Hrsg. von S. ŞAHIN, E. SCHWERTHEIM, J. WAGNER. 2 Bde. 1978. I. (xxiii, 456 p., frontisp., 57 fig., 138 pl.); II. (viii, pp. 457-1023, 39 fig., pl. 139-227) [05679 3] *set cloth* Gld. 700.—

67. Brendel, O. J. Symbolism of the sphere. A contribution to the history of earlier Greek philosophy. 1977. (xiv, 90 p., 30 pl.) [05266 6] *cloth* Gld. 76.—

68. Hommages à MAARTEN J. VERMASEREN. Recueil d'études offert par les auteurs de la série Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain à Maarten J. Vermaseren à l'occasion de son soixantième anniversaire le 7 Avril 1978. Édité par M. B. DE BOER et T. A. EDRIDGE. 3 tomes. 1978. I. (xvii, 500 p., col. frontisp., 96 pl.); II. (xvi, pp. 501-958, pl. 97-198); III. (xvi, pp. 959-1387, pl. 199-275) [05668 8] *set cloth* Gld. 960.—

69. Popa, A. et **I. Berciu.** Le culte de Jupiter Dolichenus dans la Dacie romaine. 1978. (xiv, 72 p., 15 pl., fold. map) [05451 0] *cloth* Gld. 68.—

70. Leospo, E. La mensa isiaca di Torino. 1978. (xiv, 100 p., 32 pl.) (Catalogo del Museo Egizio di Torino. Serie prima. Monumenti e Testi, 4) [05665 3] *cloth* Gld. 96.—

71. Grenier, J.-C. L'autel funéraire isiaque de Fabia Stratonice. 1978. (xiv, 34 p., 16 pl., frontisp.) [05452 9] *cloth* Gld. 46.—

72. Lunais, S. Recherches sur la lune. I. Les auteurs latins de la fin des Guerres Puniques à la fin du règne des Antonins. 1979. (xviii, 414 p.) [05823 0] *cloth* Gld. 188.—

73. Hölbl, G. Zeugnisse ägyptischer Religionsvorstellungen für Ephesus. 1978. (xii, 93 p., 2 fig., 16 pl.) [05688 2] *cloth* Gld. 92.—

74. Corpus Cultus Equitis Thracii (CCET).
I. **Gočeva, Z.,** und **M. Oppermann.** Monumenta orae Ponti Euxini Bulgariae. 1979. (xv, 122 p., frontisp., 72 pl., map) [05914 8] *cloth* Gld. 120.—
II. **Gočeva, Z.,** und **M. Oppermann.** Monumenta inter Danubium et Haemum repertae. 1. Durustorum et Vicinia, Regio Oppidi Tolbuhin, Martianopolis et Vicinia, Regio Oppidi Šumen. *in preparation*
IV. **Hampartumian, N.** Moesa Inferior (Romanian section) and Dacia. 1979. (xviii, 128 p., 123 pl., fold. map) [05921 0] *cloth* Gld. 172.—

75. Darmon, J.-P. Nympharum domus. Les pavements de la maison des Nymphes à Néapolis (Nabeul, Tunisie) et leur lecture. 1980. (xxxiv, 270 p., frontisp., 90 [26 col.] pl., fold. plan) [05978 4] *cloth* Gld. 200.—

76. Dunand, F. Religion populaire en Égypte romaine. Les terres cuites isiaques du Musée du Caire. 1979. (xii, 286 p., 128 pl., frontisp., map) [05831 1] *cloth* Gld. 196.—

77. Mastandrea, P. Un neoplatonico latino Cornelio Labeone (Testimonianze e frammenti). 1979. (xxx, 259 p.) [05876 1] *cloth* Gld. 124.—

78. Vermaseren, M. J. (ed.). Studies in Hellenistic religions. 1979. (viii, 296 p.) [05885 0] *cloth* Gld. 132.—

79. Teixidor, J. The Pantheon of Palmyra. 1979. (xx, 138 p., frontisp., 35 pl., 1 fold. map) [05987 3] *cloth* Gld. 96.—

80. Mysteria Mithrae. Proceedings of the International Seminar on the 'Religio-Historical Character of Roman Mithraism, with particular reference to Roman and Ostian Sources'. Rome and Ostia 28-31 March 1978. Edited by U. BIANCHI. 1979. (xxvii, 1005 p., 62 pl. [13 col.], 116 fig. [2 fold.], 2 fold. maps) [06001 4] *cloth* Gld. 240.—

81. Speidel, M. P. Mithras-Orion. Greek hero and Roman army god. 1980. (ix, 56 p., frontisp., 1 pl., 8 fig.) [06055 3] Gld. 28.—

82. Drijvers, H. J. W. Cults and beliefs at Edessa. 1980. (xxx, 204 p., 34 pl.) [06050 2] *cloth* Gld. 96.—

83. Pelletier, A. Le sanctuaire métroaque de Vienne (France). 1980. (x, 52 p., 8 fig., 23 pl.) [06109 6] Gld. 48.—

84. Vos, M. de. L'egittomania in pitture e mosaici romano-campani della prima età imperiale. Testo italiano di A. DE VOS. 1980. (xiii, 107 p., frontisp., 58 [2 fold.] pl., 41 fig.) [06233 5] Gld. 72.—

85. Selem, P. Les religions orientales dans la Pannonie Romaine. Partie en Yougoslavie. 1980. (xv, 293 p., frontisp., 44 pl., 6 fig., 5 maps) [06180 0] *cloth* Gld. 120.—

86. Nuovi Ritrovamenti. — **Sotgiu, G.** Per la diffusione del culto di Sabazio. Testimonianze dalla Sardegna. — **De 'Spagnolis, M.** Il Mitreo di Itri. 1980. (27 p., frontisp., 11 pl.; 33 p., 19 pl., 4 fig.) [06182 7] Gld. 48.—

87. Wild, R. A. Water in the cultic worship of Isis and Sarapis. 1981. (xxx, 307 p., 30 pl., 32 fig., 1 fold. map) [06331 5] *cloth* Gld. 128.—

88. Debord, P. Aspects sociaux et économiques de la vie religieuse dans l'Anatolie gréco-romaine. *in preparation*

89. Baumgarten, A. I. The Phoenician history of Philo of Byblos. A commentary. *in preparation*

90. des Places, E. Études Platoniciennes. *in preparation*

91. Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic religions presented to Gilles Quispel on the occasion of his 65th birthday. Edited by R. VAN DEN BROEK and M. J. VERMASEREN. *in preparation*

92. Bianchi, U. and **M. J. Vermaseren** (ed.). La soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'impero Romano. Atti del colloquio internazionale su la soteriologia dei culti orientali nell' impero romano. Roma 24-28 settembre 1979. *in preparation*

93. Vermaseren, M. J. (Hrsg.) Die orientalischen Religionen im Römerreich. 1981. (viii, 576 p., 88 pl., 2 maps) [06356 0] *cloth* Gld. 136.—

Volumes 6, 11 and 24 are out of print.

1981. Prices may be changed without notice.

E. J. Brill — P.O.B. 9000 — 2300 PA Leiden — The Netherlands

MEDE VERKRIJGBAAR DOOR BEMIDDELING VAN DE BOEKHANDEL